



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



H673

v. 5

cop. 2

*The Gift
of
Henry Barrett Learned
to Ha
Stanford University*



See
-
Exp

A History of the English Church

Edited by the late Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, D.D., F.S.A.,
Dean of Winchester,
and the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, D.Litt.

V

THE ENGLISH CHURCH

IN THE REIGNS OF
ELIZABETH AND JAMES I.



THE ENGLISH CHURCH

IN THE REIGNS OF
ELIZABETH AND JAMES I.
(1558-1625)

BY
W. H. FRERE
"

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1904

All rights reserved



428524

Y9A9811 090714-0

INTRODUCTION

INTEREST in the history of the English Church has been steadily increasing of late years, since the great importance of the Church as a factor in the development of the national life and character from the earliest times has come to be more fully and clearly recognised. But side by side with this increase of interest in the history of our Church, the want has been felt of a more complete presentment of it than has hitherto been attempted. Certain portions, indeed, have been written with a fulness and accuracy that leave nothing to be desired ; but many others have been dealt with, if at all, only in manuals and text-books which are generally dull by reason of excessive compression, or in sketches which, however brilliant and suggestive, are not histories. What seemed to be wanted was a continuous and adequate history in volumes of a moderate size and price, based upon a careful study of original authorities and the best ancient and modern writers. On the other hand, the mass of material which research has now placed at the disposal of the scholar seemed to render it improbable that any one would venture to undertake such a history single-handed, or that, if he did, he would live to complete it. The best way, therefore, of meeting the difficulty seemed to be a division of labour amongst several competent scholars, agreed in their general principles, each being responsible for a period to which he has

428524

YNAJOLI OJONMATZ



devoted special attention, and all working in correspondence through the medium of an editor or editors, whose business it should be to guard against errors, contradictions, overlapping, and repetition; but, consistency and continuity being so far secured, each writer should have as free a hand as possible. Such is the plan upon which the present history has been projected. It is proposed to carry it on far enough to include at least the Evangelical Movement in the eighteenth century. The whole work will consist of seven¹ crown octavo books uniform in outward appearance, but necessarily varying somewhat in length and price. Each book can be bought separately, and will have its own index, together with any tables or maps that may be required.

I am thankful to have secured as my co-editor a scholar who is eminently qualified by the remarkable extent and accuracy of his knowledge to render me assistance, without which, amidst the pressure of many other duties, I could scarcely have ventured upon a work of this magnitude.

W. R. W. STEPHENS.

THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER,
20th July 1899.

¹ An eighth volume dealing with "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century" has since been added.

According to present arrangements the work will be distributed amongst the following writers :—

- I. The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest, by the Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt. *Ready.*
- II. The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I., by Dean Stephens, D.D. *Ready.*
- III. The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, by the Rev. W. W. Capes, M.A., late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. *Ready.*
- IV. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary, by James Gairdner, C.B., Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh *Ready.*
- V. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., by W. H. Frere. *Ready.*
- VI. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne, by the Rev. William Holden Hutton, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. *Ready.*
- VII. The English Church from the Death of Anne to the Close of the Eighteenth Century, by the Rev. Canon Overton, D.D., and the Rev. Frederic Relton. *In preparation.*
- VIII. The English Church in the Nineteenth Century, by F. W. Cornish, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. *In preparation.*

PREFACE

THE Elizabethan period, which occupies the greater part of the present volume, is undoubtedly one of the most important eras in the ecclesiastical history of England. The reigns of the earlier Tudors had disturbed the ancient order. As Edward succeeded his father and Mary her brother, the chaos had grown steadily greater, and it was not until the reign of Elizabeth that it began to be possible to estimate what would be the ultimate effect on the English Church of waves of innovation that had been sweeping over England in common with nearly the whole of Western Europe. The period is thus full of unique interest.

It is also one that is rich in materials for the student. Over and above the mass accumulated by the patience of John Strype, there is much that has more lately become accessible in the collections of the Parker Society, the Camden Society, and elsewhere; but the stores of unpublished documents are still considerable. The papers of Lord Burghley in the Record Office and at Hatfield give such a wealth as is rarely to be had; the pamphlet literature begins to be voluminous; the official documents in Episcopal Registries are illuminating; and, in fact, it is only when the student has worked thoroughly over several of these rich corners of the field that he begins to realise how much more there is in the whole area that he has not been able to touch.

Many of the assertions and judgments contained in this book will, perhaps, be held to be novel or disputable; they

rest on authorities some of which are obscure and some not previously used. The plan of this series forbids such a complete citation of authorities as would enable the author to support his position at all points, to justify his treatment of some highly controversial questions, and to defend him against any charge of presumption in differing from earlier writers or acknowledged masters such as the late Dr. Gardiner. He has made use of the lists of authorities appended to his several chapters to lessen this disability as far as possible, and for the rest he can only appeal to the goodwill and trustfulness of the reader, and protest his own serious desire to present nothing but what he has concluded to be both true and fair according to the best of his knowledge and ability.

The number of those to whom the author's thanks are due is in reality far larger than can be recorded here, but there are some obligations that demand a special recognition. Much help in the form of information about rare or unpublished sources has been given by Miss Gertrude Simpson; Mr. H. B. M'Call kindly placed at my disposal interesting information from MS. sources about the Northern rebellion; the Rev. Canon W. J. Edmonds, the Rev. W. O. Massingberd, the Rev. R. B. Rackham, and the Rev. A. E. Alston have been good enough to investigate special points for me in Episcopal Registers. The Rev. C. E. Douglas has helped greatly in the same way and in preparing the Index. The custodians of many Episcopal Registries and other private and public collections have been uniformly kind and helpful. Finally, it is only right to record how much the little book owes to the skilful and kindly criticism of the editor of the series, the Rev. W. Hunt.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH	I

CHAPTER II

ELIZABETH'S FIRST PARLIAMENT	14
--	----

CHAPTER III

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE	32
---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV

INTERNAL AFFAIRS (1560-1562)	50
--	----

CHAPTER V

EXTERNAL POLICY AND CONTROVERSY	73
---	----

CHAPTER VI

PARLIAMENT AND CONVOCATION IN 1563	93
--	----

CHAPTER VII

GRAPPLING WITH PURITANISM	PAGE 110
-------------------------------------	-------------

CHAPTER VIII

THE "OLD RELIGION"	129
------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX

DEFINING THE <i>VIA MEDIA</i>	148
---	-----

CHAPTER X

THE END OF PARKER'S TASK	171
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI

GRINDAL'S FAILURE	191
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII

THE DEVELOPMENT AND REPRESSION OF RECUSANCY	206
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII

THE EARLY DEALINGS OF WHITGIFT WITH PURITANISM	223
--	-----

CHAPTER XIV

BEFORE THE ARMADA	238
-----------------------------	-----

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER XV

	PAGE
SECTARIES AND RECUSANTS DURING THE LAST YEARS OF ELIZABETH	257

CHAPTER XVI

THE CLOSING ENCOUNTERS OF THE REIGN WITH PURITANISM	275
---	-----

CHAPTER XVII

THE NEW DYNASTY	286
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RULE OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT	308
---	-----

CHAPTER XIX

THE POWDER PLOT	324
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XX

CONFLICTS—CONTROVERSIAL AND JUDICIAL	342
--	-----

CHAPTER XXI

THE DAYS OF ABBOT	366
-----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX I	391
----------------------	-----

APPENDIX II	393
-----------------------	-----

INDEX	395
-----------------	-----

CHAPTER I

THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH

THE reign of Queen Mary ended in gloom and disaster : at home the domestic ills which had been serious under Edward had become more alarming throughout her reign ; trade was stagnant, the treasury was empty, the currency unimproved, and for two summers epidemics had devastated the land. ^{The situation at Mary's death Nov. 17, 1558.} Abroad the French war, always unpopular, had brought disaster culminating in the loss of Calais. Negotiations were going forward for a peace, but no good seemed likely to come of it. The alliance of France with Scotland had recently been sealed by the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots with the Dauphin on April 24, 1558, while Mary of Lorraine, the regent of Scotland in the queen's absence, was working to secure the country for France and catholicism. Over the Border and over the Channel all looked ominous. At home men's hearts were sick of Spanish influence and religious persecution, and of a reaction Rome-wards, which had brought no peace or settlement, but only trouble upon trouble. Matters were ripe for a change. As the queen passed away on November 17, 1558, five of the seven and twenty episcopal sees were standing vacant ; the Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury lay dying, and survived his sovereign only a few hours ; and before the end of the year four more vacancies were caused in the episcopal college by death. There remained seventeen bishops to face the new era : two of them, Turberville and Bourne, had doubtful titles to their sees, since the deprived Edwardine bishops, namely, Coverdale of Exeter and Barlow of Bath and Wells, were still living.

The expectation of a change was widespread, but it was uncertain what its character would be. The new queen was a somewhat unknown factor in the case. She had had a troublous bringing up; as an infant in arms she was banished from the court, and before she was three years old she had been declared illegitimate; her mother's execution followed, and Elizabeth's banishment became more complete. The liberal education which was provided for her, valuable as it was, did not compensate for the absence of affection and the gentler influences due to girlhood. Nor were matters improved by a short experience of court life under Edward VI., when Elizabeth, as a girl of fifteen, became entangled in an indiscreet attachment to Lord Seymour, which came to a sinister end, and left an abiding mark upon her character. The cautiousness which she began to learn in the closing years of Edward became more highly developed in her sister's time. Her position was one of extreme difficulty. She was known to be antagonistic to the Marian policy, though she showed outward conformity; consequently all the forces which were hostile to the government tended to rally round her, and there had been times when her liberty was forfeited and her life in danger. The death of Mary set her free from the espionage which had encompassed her at Hatfield, and let loose the tongues of popularity and the pent-up enthusiasm which she had already been learning how to foster and how to control.

At the moment it was difficult, looking at the slim tall figure which at the age of five-and-twenty was riding up from Hatfield to mount the throne, to forecast what would be the power or what the policy of the new queen. But those who were behind the scenes knew that she had made skilful and complete plans, which were all matured against the time of her accession. Feria, the Spanish ambassador, reported to his master that it was arranged that William Cecil, "heretic," was to be her secretary; and some observed that the queen showed small favour to Bishop Bonner when the bishops came to meet her at Highgate at her entry into London, and would not suffer him to kiss her hand. More careful scrutiny would reveal the fact that in her opening proclamation, instead of the title "Supreme Head"

The new
queen
(1533-1603).

The opening
moves.

at the close of the queen's style, stood an innocent-looking "&c.," and later, when the same abbreviation figured in the writs of summons to Parliament, it became clear to every one that the queen had given up the much-disputed title of "Supreme Head," which had been used by the last three sovereigns, but had almost at once been discarded by Mary. The whole *personnel* of the court was speedily changed, and the young queen showed that same power of personal attraction, combined with capacity to command, which had distinguished her father, but not her brother and sister.

The Council was holding constant sessions, and the guiding spirit in them from the first was William Cecil, who thenceforward, till the day of his death as Lord Burghley in 1598, was to exercise an unrivalled ^{William Cecil, 1520-1598.} influence both on Church and State. He has already appeared upon the scene of this history as one of Somerset's subordinates; but he had survived his first master's downfall and become secretary of state. His early dealings on Somerset's behalf with Gardiner in the days of his humiliation had shown the bent of his own mind; but in the late reign he had gone to mass and had not lacked employment on quiet and unobtrusive errands, suitable to the ambiguity of his position. At Mary's death there was no more ambiguity: the new queen at once summoned him to her councils, and their momentous partnership began.

But while the characters both of the queen and of her chosen secretary pointed to coming changes, such were not at first apparent. Two great anxieties especially occupied the mind of the Council—the relations with ^{The problems of the Council,} foreign powers abroad, and the religious question at home. The supreme importance of the latter was evident from the earliest moment, and one of the earliest steps noted down by the cautious secretary to be taken was the tuning of the popular pulpit at Paul's Cross.

It seems strange, in view of what followed, that the new reign did not at once bring a reversal of the Spanish alliance; but, in fact, Philip of Spain proved Elizabeth's earliest ^{foreign} protector, and for some time contemplated marrying her. This policy was at the time the only one available for him as a counterpoise to French influence; for France, having

secured by the royal alliance its hold upon Scotland, was now putting forward Mary as the rightful Queen of England also, on the ground that a legitimate great-grand-daughter of Henry VII. had better right than a bastard daughter of Henry VIII. In such a question as this the papacy was intimately concerned; and while France urged the pope, Paul IV., to declare the queen illegitimate, Philip was sounding him as to a dispensation to marry his sister-in-law. In all these matters the Council proceeded cautiously, and the queen did her best to keep in the good books both of Philip and of the pope, by letting them know as little as possible until her course was more clear.

Similarly in matters of religion all went on outwardly as before: the queen went to mass, and had, in fact, in her first proclamation, prohibited innovations; but it was ^{and domestic.} clear to every one in England that this would be only a brief phase. Before the reign was ten days old, Feria, the Spanish ambassador, reported that Elizabeth was "every day standing up against religion more openly." The popular talk was in favour of a change of religion and against the queen's marriage with any foreigner; and already the foundation was laid of that extraordinary power of mutual understanding between queen and people, which was one of the secrets of Elizabeth's reign.

Meanwhile within her Council plans were being matured, and the all-absorbing religious problem was being resolved, not by ecclesiastics, but by statesmen and lawyers.

Goodrich's
advice.

Two important state-papers of the time reveal the secrets of the government. One is the policy of Richard Goodrich, a well-known lawyer of Edward's reign, and his paper, entitled "Divers Points of Religion," exhibits characteristically a combination of legal acumen with extreme caution. Goodrich recommended that the difficulty of dealing with the hostility of the existing bishops should be met by a threat of *præmunire*, and that they and their chief supporters should be lodged in prison before parliament assembled. No definite innovation in religion should yet be attempted, and even in parliament, meeting before or during March, nothing beyond the repeal of the statutes for burning heretics. Meanwhile much might be done without definite legal innovation.

There were precedents for appointing bishops and taking other ecclesiastical action independently of the pope; the English litany, set forth by Henry, unaffected by recent legislation, and even in use under Mary, was available still for both queen and people; and the queen at her mass in her closet might do without the elevation of the host, and might secure communion in both kinds and the presence of some to communicate. The married clergy might be winked at; preachers might be authorised "to preach the Gospel purely without inveighing against any sect, except Anabaptists and Arians," and meanwhile homilies might be prepared.

It is interesting to compare with this the policy sketched at Christmas time by a statesman, probably Cecil himself, which contrasts with the timorousness and narrowness of view of the lawyer. In this "Device for the Alteration of Religion" the dangers involved are clearly foreseen and estimated, but the upshot is that the alteration is to begin in the coming parliament. France and Scotland may be dealt with diplomatically; Rome is not to be feared, for it will not go beyond "evil will, cursing, and practising." At home the writer already sees that opposition will come from two widely different bodies—the Marian officials and clergy on the one side, who stand to lose by the change; and, on the other side, those who so favour alteration that they will not be satisfied while any of the old ceremonies and doctrines remain, but will "call the alteration a cloaked papistry or a mingle-mangle." Thus clearly at the beginning of the reign were the two great dangers of the Church foreshadowed, which later were revealed in romanism and puritanism. The Romanists are to be brought by penal laws to conform themselves to the new alterations: the other danger is to be met by a carefully drawn book of services, enforced by such severe measures as shall paralyse, or at any rate minimise, all opposition. Here the coming events cast their shadows before, and the two great measures of Elizabeth's first parliament—the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity—are already sketched out.

Meanwhile a body of learned men is to prepare a draft service-book, to be submitted first to her Majesty and then to parliament. The names of seven divines are suggested, with

The "Device
for the
Alteration of
Religion."

Sir Thomas Smith, a Cambridge scholar, a priest turned politician, as their convener. Four of the seven were soon to be found directing the course of ecclesiastical affairs among the early Elizabethan bishops. The question as to the nature of the services to be in general use during the interim is answered by a recommendation that the precedents already set by the queen should be followed, that provision should be made for a general communion at high feasts, and that at other times the clergy present should communicate with the celebrant in both kinds. Lastly, a suggestion is made full of threatening import of the changes that were to come over English worship, viz. that the queen should have for service "some other devout form of prayer or memory, and the seldomer mass."

Liturgical proposals.

This document marks a more advanced stage than Goodrich's recommendations. The queen, perhaps on the earlier advice, had early in December adopted the use of the English litany in her chapel, and the new suggestions seem to have Christmas in view. Another occurrence of the first half of December seems also to have influenced the advice here given: it was at this date that the English reformers, who had fled into exile in Mary's reign, began to return to England. The writer had already estimated the opposition which they might be expected to offer to the "alteration of religion"; but he recognised the difference of quality among the exiles, and named some of them on his list of divines.

The significance of the "Device."

Hitherto the whole policy had been shaped by laymen and by a very small body, far less than the Council, and perhaps including no more than Secretary Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon, who had succeeded Archbishop Heath as Lord Keeper, and the queen herself. But the need was felt for calling some divines into counsel; and on December 9 the first overtures were made to Matthew Parker. He, like many others at the moment, was suffering from the prevailing sickness. He had not been among the exiles, but, since his deprivation of the deanery of Lincoln and his other emoluments in 1553 and 1554, he had lived in the country with his wife and children in great obscurity and in peril of life. The character of the man, to whom Bacon and Cecil

Matthew Parker, 1504-1575.

turned to be the leader of ecclesiastical reform, is manifest at once from his negotiations with them.

Guessing only too easily what the summons portended, he pleaded ill-health as an objection to it, and that he might be allowed to occupy himself "to dispense God's reverent word amongst the simple strayed sheep of God's fold in poor destitute parishes and cures"; or else might be restored to his mastership of Benet (Corpus) College, Cambridge, rather than to his deanery of Lincoln, which, though worth ten times as much, would be far less congenial. Renewed summonses brought him up to London, and he preached at Paul's Cross on February 10, 1559, the first Sunday in Lent. But the business was by no means yet settled: on March 1 he wrote a further disclaimer, pleading that Cambridge was more befitting a man such as himself, unequal to the task of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and disqualified by the permanent results of an accident—a fall from his horse as he fled by night from such as sought for him to his peril. Bacon's reply ten weeks later was only more peremptory, and was followed by an official intimation on May 19, which, perhaps receiving no response, was repeated on the 28th. Still the doctor shrank, and petitioned the queen, "beseeching your honour to discharge me of that so high and chargeable an office"; but the former resolution was only confirmed by a second to the same effect, and at last, on August 1, Parker was elected archbishop.

The politicians had done right to insist. If learning and academic capacity had been those qualities by which Parker had been hitherto distinguished, there were others latent in him of paramount value for the task that lay before him. There were few men available, if any, who had so securely grasped the principles that were to be those of the reform of the English Church, or who were capable of carrying them through with so much gentleness, moral courage, and patient pertinacity. He had learnt priceless lessons not only in the academic walks of Cambridge, but also by the more searching tests of both prosperity and adversity. Thus, though not a genius, nor even a man of exceptional ability among the princes of the Church, he was able to do an exceptional and unique work, and under God's guidance to

steer the Church through the most difficult course which it had ever yet had to sail. The sixteen years, for which the frail student's life was yet spared, all bore witness to the soundness of the choice.

In marked contrast with Parker and with others, such as Dr. Bill and Dr. May, whose names were suggested together

The exiles, with his for the committee of prayer-book revision, stood the exiles of Queen Mary's reign, who had sought shelter and sympathy among the Protestants abroad. In Switzerland they had sat at the feet of Calvin, and at Frankfort they had disturbed the peace of that free city by their violent disputes over their order of worship. The news of the death of Mary raised their hopes, reports from England of the early doings of the new reign started them on their homeward journey, and by the end of December they were pouring back again into the country; but not the same men that they had been when they left it five years previously. Naturally the exiles had consisted mainly of those that set least store on the bonds that tied them to historic catholicity. Their low sacramental doctrine made them unacceptable to the Lutherans, and their friendship with foreigners such as Poullain and à Lasco gave them an introduction into the circle whose centre was at Geneva. In more or less degree they came under the spell of Calvin's genius, and were influenced by the imposing comprehensiveness of the new scheme of doctrine and discipline which he substituted for the system of the catholic and apostolic Church. At their return it was soon evident that they were infected by this in very varying degrees: even among the four exiles who were suggested for the prayer-book committee a distinction existed. Three of them figured later among the bishops, viz. Cox, Grindal, and Pilkington, and thus, while retaining somewhat of the exilic standpoint, they accepted official positions in which it became their duty to enforce conformity with the Church system. The fourth, David Whitehead, who had been recommended by Cranmer for the Archbishopric of Armagh, now came back to be sequestered for nonconformity in 1564 and to die in obscurity in 1571.

The factiousness which had distinguished them abroad soon manifested itself at home. It was notorious that Thomas

Bentham had been boldly officiating in London during the later part of Mary's reign, having come back from exile for the purpose at the risk of his life: not ^{and their} ~~factionousness.~~ unnaturally the returning exiles came to attend his ministrations, and after sermon "the people began to dispute among themselves about ceremonies, some declaring for Geneva and some for Frankfort." Nor was this the only piece of factious behaviour. On Christmas day a mob, headed by two cobblers, assembled at the church of Austin Friars, which had been the home of one of the congregations of foreign protestants in Edward's time, and had since been the Italian church. Failing to obtain admission, the people broke their way into the church, and the two cobblers, arriving no doubt simultaneously at the pulpit, proceeded unabashed to deliver two simultaneous harangues against the late queen and cardinal, and the old beliefs. After a surfeit of four sermons the scene was re-enacted in the French church the same afternoon. The Italians complained and had the matter referred to the Council, but the mob continued its way on St. Stephen's day, and promised to observe the other holy days in similar fashion.

Meanwhile a very different occurrence was taking place in the neighbouring city of Westminster. The queen had come there to spend Christmas, and she sent instructions beforehand to Oglethorp, Bishop of ^{The queen's} ~~Carlisle~~, ^{Christmas,} who was to sing the high mass before ^{1558.} her, that he was not to elevate the host: clearly this moment had been chosen to inaugurate the policy in this respect advocated by Goodrich. To the queen's order Oglethorp returned a respectful but firm refusal, and consequently the queen rose and left after the gospel. On the following days the order was carried out by the royal chaplains; the elevation was omitted, and her Majesty heard mass through.

The official commentary on these two events was issued two days later in the proclamation which was intended to satisfy the Italian consul and the Spanish ambassador, who had complained of the proceedings at Austin Friars, and was intended also as an *ad interim* ^{A proclama-} ~~direction~~ ^{tion as to wor-} ^{ship, Dec. 27,} ^{1558.} how far innovation would be allowed to go, pending the assembly of parliament, which was summoned

for the last week of January. After calling attention to the disputes in matters of religion and the breaches of the peace which had resulted, especially in London, from the preaching, the order was given that no one was to preach or to listen to any preaching. The bare recitation in English, without any exposition, of the liturgical epistle and gospel and of the Ten Commandments was sanctioned. This had been in Edward's day a preliminary to the issue of the prayer-book. But it was forbidden "to use any other manner of public prayer, rite, or ceremony in the church, but that which is already used and by law received, or the common litany used at this present in her Majesty's own chapel, and the Lord's Prayer and the Creed in English." Here was further proof in the use of the litany of the adoption of Goodrich's policy; and no one could be in doubt that he might buy and use one of the copies of the litany which now began to issue from the press. But one who had heard of the incident at Westminster might, if possessed of a legal mind, be well excused for doubting how far he was authorised to follow that precedent, recommended though it was too, if he only knew it, by one of the greatest lawyers of the day.

The Londoner's mind, however, was probably much more full of the coming pageant, and of all the stirring scenes that graced every moment the appearance of the new queen. The coronation was fixed for January 15, and for weeks beforehand the preparations were being made. The turn of affairs was represented even in the decoration of the streets at the royal progress on the previous day, for in Cornhill a triumphal arch elaborately emphasised the change from superstition to true religion; and in Cheapside, when a copy of the New Testament was presented to the queen, she is said to have clasped it in her arms and embraced it passionately. The ceremonies within the Abbey were also significant of the transitional state of affairs, in which it could be said, according to the different standpoint of the speaker, either that "the old mass and office were going on in the old way," or that "the greater part of the people, following the queen's example, have entirely renounced the mass," or thirdly, that while "the queen appears to continue in the religion professed

The coronation preliminaries,

and service,

by her sister, many persons, nevertheless, of their own authority had made a great change and again introduced the method of celebrating according to the manner observed under King Edward." The coronation mass was said in Latin, with the epistle and gospel read in English as well as Latin; and, of two contrary reports, that one is more probably true which states that the elevation was omitted and the celebrant was George Carew, Dean of the Chapel Royal.

But ere the mass itself was reached, it was revealed that Oglethorp, the Bishop of Carlisle, though he still was unwilling to celebrate as the queen desired, had nevertheless been prevailed upon at the last moment to perform ^{conducted by Oglethorp in part} the ceremonies of the actual coronation. Heath, Archbishop of York, and probably other bishops had refused to execute them, though they went so far as to meet the queen with all the old solemnities at Westminster Hall, and to attend upon her as she went to the Abbey. The ceremonies of the coronation were conducted by Oglethorp according to the *Liber Regalis* of the day unaltered, and some bishops went so far as to assist in them. Cecil's watchful eye had already perused them, and made provision that nothing should be omitted. The queen might have claimed, by old precedent, to communicate in both kinds, and it was said at the time that she did so; but the Spanish ambassador, who did not himself stay to the mass, reported to his master that this was not the case.

Thus far the alterations that had been made in matters of religion were not extensive; but the first two months of the reign had been big with the promise of what was to come. The action was entirely confined to ^{The action of the bishops.} the queen herself, and, though the Council was active in certain respects, it was not with her lords in general, but with the innermost circle of her advisers, that she took counsel in ecclesiastical affairs. It was a proclamation that first tacitly laid aside the title of Supreme Head, and it was by proclamation that innovation in religion was first forbidden, and then enjoined only within certain prescribed limits. The existing bishops were biding their time: Archbishop Heath had at once resigned his chancellorship; Christopherson, Bishop of Chichester, had got himself into trouble by

following up the safe discourse which Cecil's cautious care provided for Paul's Cross on the first Sunday of the new reign, with a contradictory oration on the following Sunday; thereupon he was sent to prison, and before the year was out he was dead.

Bishop White of Winchester had his opportunity of protest when it fell to his lot to preach at the late queen's funeral on December 14, and he did not fail to use it. The contrast that he drew between those that remained true to the Church and those that fell away to the new Church of Geneva might have been allowed to pass; so also the strong assertion of sacramental doctrine and of the eternal vengeance that awaits heresy; even the exhortation to pastors to warn the flock that "the wolves be coming out of Geneva" might also have been tolerated; but his comparison of the late and the present queen, with special regard to the ecclesiastical supremacy, could hardly be ignored. Even Heath, it is said, joined in preferring a charge of sedition against the preacher, which cost him his freedom for more than a month. After these two attempts little was done by the bishops, and all expectation centred in the coming parliament.

White's
funeral
sermon.

AUTHORITIES.—The chief repertory for Ecclesiastical History in Elizabeth's reign is Strype's collections, comprising the *Annals*, which extend to 1588, but have illustrative documents covering the further period to 1604; together with the *Lives of Parker, Grindal, Whitgift*, each of which is of large dimensions, and *Lives of Aylmer and Sir Thomas Smith*, on a smaller scale. This repertory is quite invaluable, but must be handled with caution. The *State Papers* of the reign have been calendared;—the *Domestic Papers* so briefly that recourse has always been had to the original MSS. at the Record Office: the *Venetian and Spanish Papers* are of great value as to ecclesiastical matters early in the reign, and the *Calendars* are full. Some additional information may be gleaned from K. de Lettenhove, *Relations Politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre*, the Belgian State papers, which give the documents in full and untranslated: the eleven vols. extend from 1555 to 1579. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vols. v. and vi., cover the first twelve years of the reign, and are of first-rate importance. Creighton, *Elizabeth*, should be read as the best biography of the queen; many other biographies are well written in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. The proclamations of the reign are in H. Dyson's Collection of *Proclamations*, of which there is a copy in the Brit. Mus. Many have been reprinted: see especially, Wilkins, *Concilia*, and Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*; Dr. Prothero, *Statutes*, etc.; Messrs. Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, etc. The *Zurich Letters* (Parker Society) give much information as to ecclesiastical affairs for the first twenty years of the reign, and the *Parker Correspondence* in the same collection is a principal authority. Wright, *Q. Elizabeth and her Times*, contains other valuable

letters belonging to this reign. As to the title of Supreme Head, see Prof. Maitland in *Engl. Hist. Rev.* xv. 120, and as to the Christmas mass, see *ibid.* 329. Dr. Gee has printed in *The Elisabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments* (1902) the *Device for Alteration of Religion* and Goodrich's *Divers Points*. The coronation is discussed in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* ii. 497; the *Passage* of the queen on the previous day is described in a contemporary tract reprinted in Arber, *An English Garner*, and by Mr. Pollard, *Tudor Tracts*. Cp. Nichols, *Progresses of Q. Elisabeth*. The popular stories recounted in R. Ware, *The Hunting of the Romish Fox*, are probably apocryphal.

CHAPTER II

ELIZABETH'S FIRST PARLIAMENT

At an earlier hour than usual on St. Paul's day, January 25, 1559, the mass for the opening of parliament was sung at Westminster Abbey according to the use of the chapel royal. Later in the day the queen went in state to Westminster amid the plaudits and prayers of her people. At the Abbey she was received by the abbot and monks with lights, incense, and holy water; but as she proceeded to her canopy by the high altar, while her choir sang the English litany, she dismissed the candle-bearing monks who accompanied her, saying, "Away with those torches, for we see very well." The preacher was Dr. Cox, a heavily beneficed married priest of Edward's day, but since then, first a prisoner, and then an exile and a prominent figure on the conservative side in the troubles about the prayer-book at Frankfort. He was newly returned all hot from abroad, and for an hour and a half he kept the peers standing, while he inveighed against the monks and demonstrated that the existing system of worship was great impiety and idolatry. This done, the scene was shifted to the House of Lords.

It was an anxious moment in the history of the Church and nation; the future was difficult to forecast, and the whole responsibility rested in the hands of a very few—the queen herself, with Bacon, Cecil, and Bedford, and perhaps one or two more of the Council. Of the two schemes for the alteration of religion which have been described, the second proved to be the one adopted; but

The balance
of parties in
the country

when cautious Cecil adopts the more venturesome of the plans, what result is to be looked for? Goodrich had allowed for a very strong opposition to any change of religion, and he clearly was wise in doing so. Feria, the Spanish ambassador, estimated that "of the nobility all the young men and most of the old are attacked with heresy," and that "London, Kent, and the sea-ports are very heretical"; but "the rest of the country is sound and catholic, so that in the aggregate the Catholics are in a majority." A little later he expressed himself "sure that religion will not fall, because the catholic party is two-thirds larger than the other." Events proved that his calculations were as erroneous as his nomenclature; but it no doubt was a reasonable estimate at the time, and therefore may fairly be taken to describe the character of the venture on which the government had entered.

It is difficult to gauge how far parliament was representative of the country: the Upper House comprised some sixty lay peers, and the episcopate, now reduced to sixteen members; in addition to these there was the Abbot ^{and in parliament.} of Westminster to be reckoned with, but not the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem, since it would seem that his proxy was refused and his membership of the House disallowed. No one could doubt that the spiritual peers would offer a solid resistance to the chief part of the government's programme; and this was all the more serious, as the bishops, though not men of any special mark, were looked up to in the House as guides in ecclesiastical and spiritual questions. Jewel had good reason to complain that, "having none there on our side to expose their artifices and confute their falsehoods, they reign as sole monarchs in the midst of ignorant and weak men." There was less likelihood of difficulty in the Lower House if, as Feria stated, it consisted "of persons chosen throughout the country as being the most perverse and heretical"; but this statement looks like one of the Spaniard's chronic bursts of anti-English feeling, and the English Commons could hardly be expected to be so pliant as Feria thought.

From other points of view the throne was still extremely insecure: the question of Elizabeth's legitimacy had still to be settled, even in England; while abroad, if the pope decided

to pronounce an adverse judgment, all would soon be thrown into confusion. The peace with France was not yet concluded, and meanwhile it was more than ever the interest of the French king to contest Elizabeth's rights on behalf of his daughter-in-law, Mary of Scotland. On the other hand, so long as France was hostile, Spain would be friendly on political grounds. But for how long would it be safe to count upon the continuance of the friendship of a bigot like Philip, when once the alterations in religion seriously began?

Again, the form which those alterations were to take was not by any means clear. The queen's instinct probably was to return to Henry's position : but this was impossible ; among other things it involved the title of "Supreme Head," and the difficulty which was bound up with this had not been obviated but only shelved by the ingenious "&c." of the royal style so far used. Moreover, the catholicism of "The King's Book" of 1543 was a doctrinal standard which, in existing circumstances, could not be set up again by reformers ; and, that being so, what was the standard to be ? There was no lack of voices to shout for Zurich or Geneva, but these were repugnant to the queen, who was probably telling the truth when she protested to Feria that "she believed that God was in the sacrament of the eucharist, and only dissented from three or four things in the mass." Consequently she was inclined to look wistfully to Germany, to the League of Smalkald and the Confession of Augsburg ; and this brought down upon her lengthy and ponderous protests from the party of Zurich.

Another serious difficulty was the anomaly of carrying ecclesiastical changes in the face of the bishops and prelates : the old bishops were sure to oppose them ; no new appointments could be made under existing conditions to the ten vacant sees ; and therefore, for the moment, the only course open was an arbitrary intrusion into the ecclesiastical sphere, which the queen knew as well as any one to be normally indefensible. Add to all these problems a host of minor points, the question of finance, the pressing question of the validity of the deprivations both of bishops and priests in previous reigns, and the leases, tenures, etc.,

Parliamentary
difficulties.

depending on it, the question of the new monasteries, the first-fruits of benefices—there was enough to daunt the courage of the most seasoned politician.

The programme of the government was unfolded in the opening speech made in her Majesty's name by Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Lord Keeper. First among the three points which he emphasised came the religious question, the need of "a uniform order of religion." ^{The business begins.}

He expressed the queen's desires that, without respect of persons and without contentiousness, the parliament would pass such laws as would prevent both the danger of idolatry and superstition and the opposite peril of irreverence and irreligion. On January 30 the legislative business began in each House. The Lords discussed a bill designed to restore to the Crown the ecclesiastical first-fruits and tenths which Henry in 1534 had diverted, mainly from the pope's pocket, to his own, and Mary had restored to the Church. Meanwhile the Commons were discussing the subsidy, and questioning the validity of writs which had gone out without the title "Supreme Head." The committee appointed to consider the matter soon reported in their favour, but the incident was somewhat ominous. When the Lower House had settled the finance and sent its proposals to the Upper House, it was confronted with several government bills. Three of these caused little trouble and were finished in a few days; they were all concerned with the security of the throne, the queen's legitimacy, title, and so forth; but the Bill of first-fruits already mentioned and a bill concerning treasons were not so easily despatched. It is not clear what the difficulties were in the latter case which postponed the passing of the Bill till March 20; but in the former case the bishops gave the first signs of their opposition, eight of them voting against the bill and being apparently unsupported by any lay votes. In the Commons there was considerable delay before the bill was passed and returned to the Lords with certain amendments; there it met again with further alteration and the renewed opposition of nine spiritual peers, before being finally concluded on March 22.

So far the government had triumphantly carried five of its chief measures besides the subsidy; but one of the first magni-

tude had been in serious trouble, and was still in the balances, while another of crucial importance had been rejected. On February 9 the "Bill to restore the Supremacy of the Church of England to the Crown of England" was introduced in the Commons and had its first reading; but after a long debate it was rejected at the second reading on February 13. This was only a momentary blow—for, as a keen-eyed Italian said, "it will inevitably pass"; and the two following days were spent in drawing a new Supremacy Bill, which was introduced on the 21st. In the meanwhile two bills about the church service had been introduced—one on the 15th, and one on the 16th, which probably were concerned with the new order of service hereafter to be described (p. 27), which was drafted in committee and defended by Dr. Guest: neither of these ever reappeared, and there seems little doubt that the government was defeated. The result was that some liturgical provisions sanctioning the old "Second Book" of 1552 were incorporated in the new Supremacy Bill, which came up again on the 22nd and 25th of February, and, meeting with strong opposition, was only carried through by drastic measures on the part of Cecil. Its course in the Lords was equally eventful: introduced on February 27, it was read on the 28th, and then came to a stay.

It was on that very day that the convocation of Canterbury hurled the one thunderbolt which was the sum-total of its action throughout the session. The meeting was opened by Bonner, Bishop of London, in the chapter-house at St. Paul's on January 27, with an explanation that there was to be no sermon, because the Council had forbidden sermons in the cathedral for the time being. The following week the prolocutor of the Lower House was elected, and after another week's interval he came on February 10, with three others, to ask that means should be devised to prevent a change of religion. To this the bishops replied that in their opinion the thing needful was to petition the queen that the clergy might be spared any tax for the present. After another fortnight the prolocutor returned to the Upper House with five Articles drawn up by the clergy to disburden their consciences and to

The Supremacy Bill.

The intervention of convocation.

make a protestation of faith, and on the eventful February 28 the bishops accepted them and undertook to present them to the House of Lords on the following day. Their reception by the Lord Keeper was purely formal, but the thunderbolt was enough to give pause to the government. Three of the Articles dealt with the mass and were the same three as had proved fatal to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley in the disputation at Oxford which preluded their fiery end in 1554; the fourth affirmed the supremacy of the See of Rome, while the fifth declared that authority in faith, sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline belongs to the pastors of the Church and not to the laity. The thunderbolt was thus hurled in defiance of the government and the Supremacy Bill, and it left a smell of burning behind it.

On the Bill being read, as has been noted, for the first time in the Lords on February 28, there followed a three days' debate in which both Houses were concerned; no conclusion was reached, and for the moment the subject was dropped. The opposition had proved effective, for the bishops, with some of the lay peers, led by Shrewsbury and Montagu, had made it impossible to pass the liturgical clauses, which had been imported into the Bill in the Commons with the object of reimposing the Edwardine services under heavy penalties. During the deadlock which ensued the peace with France was being concluded, though it was not finally signed till March 21. Two such different observers as Feria and Grindal can hardly have been wrong when they saw a connexion between the success of the negotiations and the progress of the Supremacy Bill; for on March 13 it again reappeared, was read a second time, and referred to a committee: the obnoxious clauses were voted on and defeated, and the question of services disappeared. The Bill was further modified and given a form like that in which it had been originally brought forward, but somewhat more moderate; the papal supremacy was to be abolished, and the queen was to take the title of Supreme Head if she chose; all clergy and office-holders under the Crown were to assent to this by oath or else be deprived.

Two speeches have been preserved which show the quality of the opposition. Archbishop Heath stated with admirable

A deadlock
and the way
out.

clearness the two main points of his case. While speaking severely of the existing pope, Paul IV., as "a very austere stern father unto us since his first entry into Peter's chair," he maintained that to forsake the papacy was wrong, because it involved a breach with all general councils, all canonical and ecclesiastical laws of the Church, the judgment of all other Christian princes, and the unity of Christ's Church. These four subjects he handled in a way which fully bears out the complaint made by Jewel (p. 15). His second main point was the discussion of the meaning of the Supremacy, and he claimed with some justice that the wording of the Act as it there stood—"Supreme Head of the Church of England immediate and next under God"—claimed for the Crown a spiritual government which could not be conceded to any layman, much less to a woman.

Scott, Bishop of Chester, speaking, as probably Heath did, at the third reading on March 18, thanked the committee for the two main points which had been won for the conservatives by the compromise, viz. that the substitution of the English for the Latin services was dropped, and that the penal clauses of the bill were mitigated. He brought forward the usual arguments to prove the papacy to be the necessary centre of Christian unity, showed that no temporal prince can be head of the Church or have spiritual authority, replied at length to the objections urged against the primacy of St. Peter, and ended with a comparison of the pedigrees of Lutheranism and catholicism, which doubtless was effective at a moment when it seemed doubtful whether the English Church would not cease to be catholic and become Lutheran. At the division it appeared that only two lay peers joined the prelates in their opposition, viz. the Lords Shrewsbury and Montagu; the rest of those present accepted the compromise.

But the troubles of the government with this bill were not yet over. The Commons did not recognise the altered bill as their handiwork, and were very angry at the changes. They, however, accepted the bill after much controversy with the addition of a further proviso; and so the matter was concluded hastily in the

Speeches on
the Supremacy
Bill of the
Archbishop
of York

and the
Bishop of
Chester.

The straits
of the
government,

Lords on March 22. It was now Holy Week, and the session was to have been adjourned on the 18th, the Saturday before Palm Sunday; but the action of the House of Lords had left the government in a fix: no provision had been made for any change of service-books, the Edwardine religion was still illegal, there was no prospect of filling the vacant bishoprics; in short, a most important section of the government plans had been defeated at the last moment; it had been necessary to sacrifice much and to postpone the adjournment of parliament even to get the Supremacy Bill through.

In the emergency recourse was had to desperate expedients: a bill was introduced into the Commons on March 21, and hurried through both Houses in the two days of the session that remained, "for the collation of bishops by the Queen's Highness and without rites and ceremonies." The royal assent was never given to this, and thus the old method of election and confirmation was retained. A similar hurried attempt was made to secure immunity for the Edwardine religion and the restoration of at any rate three Edwardine bishops to their former sees; for the votes of three bishops would be valuable in the Upper House, and the ejection of the existing bishops, which it involved, would perhaps be more grateful still: but both these projects came to nothing. The "Bill to restore deprived Bishops" figured only once in the Commons, on March 15, while the "Bill that no persons shall be punished for using the religion used in King Edward's last year" apparently passed the Commons, and appeared once under a different title in the Lords, only to disappear again. Half the parliament was gone: the government had passed ten bills, including the mangled Supremacy Bill and the revolutionary Bill about the bishoprics; but the "change of religion," so far as worship went, had been defeated, and the old doctrinal standards held the field. There was some talk of the queen going to parliament on Good Friday to give her assent to the measures passed; but Elizabeth had no intention of availing herself of the Supremacy Bill in its existing form by taking the title of Supreme Head, and at the last moment her visit was postponed.

The government felt the need of more popular support to enable it to complete its programme after the recess. Hitherto there had not been wanting popular demonstrations in favour of change; but beyond the pulpit, which had been carefully tuned, though not to a very melodious note, the chief influences were not very creditable: derisive plays, sacrilegious thefts and iconoclastic outrages, though they might delight the mob, could hardly be expected to impress favourably the hesitating or the reluctant, and reconcile them to the reforms in contemplation. Arrangements were made, therefore, for an imposing theological discussion to be conducted at Westminster during the recess, in which England was to be edified by witnessing the defeat of medieval by reformed doctrine.

Easter came, and with it a striking change: the Supremacy Act revived the Edwardine Act for communion in both kinds, and though it had not yet received the royal assent (and in fact never did in this form), on the day that it passed parliament—Wednesday in Holy Week, March 22—a proclamation was issued, based on it, and authorising communion in both kinds. The reason was given that “great numbers not only of the nobility and gentlemen but also of the common people of this realm be persuaded in conscience” that they cannot receive the holy sacrament otherwise. The exceptional character of this procedure is excused by the fact that the Act is too long to print, and that it has been impossible so far to establish “any other manner of the divine service for the communion.” Pastors and curates and others are exhorted to act accordingly; but where communion in both kinds is refused, the clergy so refusing are not to be molested, but the parishioners who desire it are “to resort to some other honest, discreet, and learned priest or minister” for the same. This authorisation, though somewhat unusual, met the immediate difficulty. But in the queen’s chapel innovation went further. On Easter day “mass was sung in English according to the use of her brother King Edward,” and after mass the celebrant took off his vestments and gave communion in both kinds vested in a surplice only: the action was deliberate, for the queen had alluded to her intention in a conversation with the Spanish ambassador on Good Friday: but for

The Easter
recess, 1559.

The proclama-
tion for
Easter com-
munion.

the time this precedent was not followed up, and otherwise service went on as before.

All through the past two months while parliament had been in session, the Council had had much trouble to repress disorders on both sides; unlicensed preaching went on, and more than one parson found his way into prison or into the pillory for "lewd" or seditious words. The turning of the tide.

At the same time, in London at any rate, the protestant ferment was strong, and outrages and tumults were not uncommon. On Easter Tuesday, Bow Church was wrecked and the sacrament profaned by a mob inflamed by violent sermons; popular sympathy went with the outrage, and the Lord Mayor was slow to redress the disorder. Reports of a similar outrage came to the Council from Suffolk. The tide was slowly turning, and, as Schifanoja, the Italian servant of Sir Thomas Tresham, reported to the authorities at Mantua, "although the Protestants increase in numbers, they are not so powerful as the Catholics, who comprise all the chief personages of the kingdom with very great command in their estates; having also many followers; and the greater part of the common people out of London, in several provinces, are much attached to the catholic religion." The estimate in its misleading terminology and in its exaggerated optimism is characteristic of an Italian papist, but it gives an insight into the condition of things. The tide was so rapidly turning, in fact, that a number of the supporters of the Marian religion were preparing to leave, or even already leaving, the country; and it became more easy to anticipate what reception would be given to the changes.

At the disputation which the Council had planned for the Easter recess, the champions of the Marians, four bishops and four doctors, were to dispute with the champions of the exiles on three points—(1) the use of vernacular services; (2) the authority of every Church to change rites and ceremonies; and (3) the propitiatory character of the sacrifice of the mass. The Westminster Disputation, March 31, From the first there were misunderstandings as to the procedure. The Council desired a popular discussion conducted on paper and in English, in which the exiles should have the last word; the Marians were eager for a disputation in Latin to be carried on by alternate

arguments, and they manœuvred to secure the last word for themselves. It is not clear how far any definite programme was agreed upon: on the question of language the Marians yielded; but when they faced their opponents in Westminster Abbey, before the privy council and a great concourse, they were not prepared with a written statement on the first point. Consequently, when Sir Nicholas Bacon, as moderator, called upon them to open, they put forward Dr. Cole, Dean of St. Paul's, to make a speech on their side. When he had finished, the statement of the exiles was read at length, and the Marians were anxious to reply; but Bacon would not allow this, and, bidding them to put their reply into writing and hand it in, he adjourned the disputation.

When the proceedings reopened on April 3, Bacon explained that it had been agreed now to turn to the second topic, and called upon the Marians, as before, to open the disputation by reading their statement on the second point. The bishops replied that they were now ready with their written statement on the first topic, and demanded that this should be taken first. The Lord Keeper adhered to the plan of procedure laid down by the Council; the bishops complained of it as being unfair to them and contrary to the order given to them on the previous day, and an unseemly wrangle followed. Eventually the Archbishop of York, who sat among the Council, pointed out to the bishops that it had been arranged to take the second question on the second day, and urged them to begin the disputation upon it. To this appeal the bishops yielded; but they put forward at once a claim that the exiles, and not they, ought to open, basing it partly on the technicalities of procedure, and partly on the line that the bishops were catholics defending the Church, and therefore their adversaries should begin. This statement of the situation was indignantly repudiated by the reformers, who exclaimed, "We are of the true catholic Church and maintain the verity thereof." This led to personalities; and the Lord Keeper, after appealing in vain to each bishop in turn to open the subject, broke up the assembly with the sinister remark to the bishops, "And for that ye will not that we should hear you, you may perhaps shortly hear of us." Thus the disputation ended in a fiasco: possibly each side had been content

that it should ; but it was the bishops that lost ground by this course, while the government gained its end ; for the Marian views were discredited, and the change of religion correspondingly facilitated. That same evening the Council sent the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln to the Tower for the contempt and disobedience that they had shown to its authority, and ordered the other Marian disputants to report themselves daily at the council board.

The reopening day of parliament had meanwhile come, but the sitting was adjourned in order that the members might attend the second day's disputation. There remained much to be done : besides new projects which had yet to come up, there were left over from the earlier meetings a few small bills, and one very large item, viz.

Minor
legislation
after Easter,
1559.

the whole question of service-books and worship. Moreover, the question of the supremacy was not yet settled in spite of all that had been done. The queen had no intention of taking the title "Supreme Head." Consequently on April 10, Cecil brought to the Lower House a royal message to that effect, and a request that the Commons would "devise some other form with regard to the supremacy or primacy" ; whereupon a new Supremacy Bill had its first reading. The question of services was kept back for the present, and the early days were taken up in the Lords with a bill authorising an exchange of lands, etc., between the Crown and any vacant episcopal see, and in the Commons with a project for restoring the clergy who had been deprived under Mary. The exchange of lands was an ingenious method of robbing the Church at a moment of weakness by taking away the estates of the sees and giving back in return other church property already confiscated, such as inappropriate tithe ; the bill, however, was rapidly passed through both Houses. Among its 134 supporters were many who already had their pockets lined with the spoils of the Church, but its opposers numbered 90 in the Commons ; eight spiritual peers voted against it in the Lords, and later in the year, after the bill had become law, the five existing bishops-elect wrote on October 15 a letter of protest to the queen ; but all alike was in vain. The bill for the restoration of the deprived had soon to make way for the two major proposals of the government, but it came up again at the close of the

session, and passed into law, together with a bill which granted the Marian religious houses to the Crown.

It was round the two principal bills that the conflict mainly raged. The Supremacy Bill, though it had already passed and

The new
Supremacy
Bill.

was now being presented again in a far more moderate form than before, was not allowed to go through unopposed, at any rate in the Lords. The speech of Archbishop Heath on the second reading has unfortunately not been preserved ; it would have been interesting to compare it with his former speech, and to see whether he was able to appreciate the difference between the two proposals (which even the sharp-eyed Spanish ambassador either did not or would not see), or to realise that the change of term from Supreme Head to Supreme Governor had cut away the best part of his former platform from under his feet. After being in committee for a week, the bill reappeared with a new proviso, and passed its third reading in face of such opposition as could be given by one lay peer, Lord Montagu, and ten spiritual peers. The fight was maintained gamely to the last, for when the bill came back with a new proviso from the Commons, the Bishop of Ely seized the opportunity of raising fresh opposition : it was a last vain attempt, for apparently the proviso was read three times in one day, and the final stage was concluded without any division. The Act marked a return to the Henrician relation with Rome, but with some significant changes, especially the constitutional provision for a body of ecclesiastical commissioners to exercise the royal supremacy on behalf of the Crown.

The chief question still remained. Hitherto there had been little that could be called in the language of the day "a change of religion" : doctrinal points, apart from the papacy

Liturgical
charge.

and communion in both kinds, had hardly come into question. It was the service-books, which at this epoch, as at the Edwardine epoch, symbolised a real doctrinal change ; and the final part of the task which the government had undertaken was to carry things again on past the Henrician point to the Edwardine. There is no evidence to show whether the committee of revision proposed by Cecil had ever come into being, had ever discussed at Sir Thomas Smith's house the two "messes of meat," or enjoyed the

"provisions of wood, coals, and drink" that were suggested for it. It is, however, clear that some committee of revision sat and drew up a draft service-book, though all the evidence available is an undated letter written probably to Cecil by Edmund Guest. He was not one of those named in the "Device for the Alteration of Religion," but he had evidently a considerable share in whatever it was that was going on. Guest had for some time been prominent on the side of reform. As a Cambridge scholar in 1548 he had written against "the privy mass," and he was so far a marked man as to have much ado to hide in Mary's time. His powers of disputation and scholarship, which had been well tested in 1549, were utilised in the Westminster disputation; he was marked out therefore for preferment, soon became Bishop of Rochester, and eventually Jewel's successor at Salisbury.

In his letter he brings arguments against a return to the First Prayer-book: "Ceremonies once taken away as evil should not be taken again"; the prayer for the dead in the mass of 1549 "doth seem to make for the sacrifice for the dead"; the consecration prayer is objectionable, partly because it claims to be a consecration prayer, partly also because of the petition, "that the bread and wine may be Christ's body, which makes for the popish transubstantiation," and partly because of the absence of any direction that the people should receive the sacrament in their hands. But besides objecting to the First Prayer-book, it is to be gathered also from Guest's letter that he was defending a new draft service-book which went beyond the Second Book in the direction of innovation: which forbade the sign of the cross, forbade all procession outside the church, directed all non-communicants to be dismissed, and that before the creed, and left communicants free to receive either standing or kneeling. Guest evidently felt that all these views would not be liked by the government: nor was he far wrong; for, when the Bill of Uniformity was introduced, it followed other lines.

Even when the plans of the government were settled, the question remained whether it was strong enough to carry them through; and it is tempting to suppose that the bill to revive Edward's Act for the keeping of fasts and festivals was used as a *ballon d'essai* to test

Guest and the
abortive draft
service-book.

The
Uniformity
Bill

the feeling of the House. Its course in the Commons is not quite clear, and was probably therefore uneventful: it was read in the Lords on April 14 and 15, and then dropped. On Tuesday, April 18, the Uniformity Bill was read for the first time in the Lower House. The book which it authorised was the Second Book of Edward, with alterations which, though few, were very important, and not in the direction that Guest had wished: its bareness was remedied by the proviso that the Edwardine ornaments were to be retained and be in use: a few textual alterations were specified, the most important being the combining together into one the two sentences provided for the distribution of the holy sacrament in the First and Second Books respectively. Other alterations were made in the prayer-book, but not specified in the act, notably the omission of the black rubric which had been foisted at the last moment by the Council into the service-book of 1552, in order to explain away the practice of kneeling at reception: the havoc which this interpolation had played with the eucharistic doctrine was thus stopped, and the whole doctrinal level of the restored book was altered. The act provided that "this order and form" should be used, "and no other or otherwise," under very heavy penalties—deprivation and imprisonment for spiritual persons so offending, fine and imprisonment for others who aided or abetted them or spoke against the book, spiritual censures as well as fines for those who did not attend church on Sundays and holidays. Justices and bishop were to vie with one another in executing the act, and the ecclesiastical commissioners, newly provided by the Act of Supremacy, were to be called in to advise with the sovereign and take further order about the ornaments, or to ordain and publish further ceremonies and rites.

The bill passed rapidly through both Houses, and was concluded in ten days, for the government had known how to profit by past failures, and the transformed Edwardine book was a delicately balanced compromise; but in the Lords it encountered steady opposition. Behind the red woollacks on the right of the Chancellor, on the benches of the spirituality, there sat a small and diminishing knot of men determined to resist reform to the last. Already on seven occasions they had

meets
opposition
only in the
Lords.

voted *en masse* against various measures, and almost entirely unsupported by any lay peers; their eighth chance came with the Bill of Uniformity, and their ninth and last with the bill dissolving the religious houses. They could not be said to represent the old bishops of the pre-Reformation Church: Tunstall was the only one whose episcopate reached behind the breach with Rome, and he was too old to be in his place in parliament; moreover, in spite of his years he was more liberal-minded than the rest, and, indeed, if there had been more bishops of his sort, things might have been very different. Four belonged to the later years of Henry VIII., but the remaining ten were all Mary's nominees; four of these never appeared in these voting lists at all, and a fifth appeared only once, and then for a private bill at the very beginning of the session; so that even with the Marian abbot of the new Italianised convent of Westminster the little party on the benches of the spirituality never rose above ten. The influence that it was expected to have at the beginning of the session upon the votes of others proved to be illusory. Nine lay peers voted with the spiritual peers against the Uniformity Bill, but against the Supremacy Bill, on the first occasion two, and on the second only one; on all the other important occasions they were less supported still, and in four cases out of the nine they stood alone. Their opposition thus represented only the last remains of a spent reaction or the twilight of a day that was over.

Two speeches delivered against the Uniformity Bill have been preserved—one by Abbot Feckenham, whose name, for some unknown reason, does not figure in the voting list; the other by Bishop Scott of Chester, whose argument against the Supremacy Bill has already been described. Unfortunately none of the speeches on the other side are preserved, though they are alluded to by Bishop Scott. The abbot made the most of the inaccurate phraseology of the time, which called the proposed changes a "change of religion." He contrasted the two religions in three respects, asking which best satisfied the Vincentian canon as being "observed in the Church of Christ of all men, and at all times and seasons, and in all places; which had most stability; and which best tended to peace and godliness."

Speeches
of Abbot
Feckenham

His whole speech was unworthy of so good a man, being full of inaccuracies and false statements and suggestions, even about things that must have been within the knowledge of the lay peers, such as the contents and regulations of the Edwardine prayer-books.

The bishop was more weighty, and put his case well; but his speech was full of the blind obscurantism with which timorous minds vainly attempt to stifle reform. The old religion, he argued, is not to be called in question; it has been settled these hundreds of years; parliament is incompetent to deal with it; it must go on as before. Turning to eucharistic doctrine, which was all through the matter principally in dispute, ^{and Bishop Scott.} Scott blamed the new "book of religion" for abolishing "the additions of the holy fathers for adorning" of the service, and "the ordinances of the apostles as to the form" of the sacraments, which he explained to mean crossing, exorcism, invocation of saints, etc. He further urged that it did away with the very institution of Christ himself, inasmuch as both oblation and consecration are taken away, and explained that inasmuch as there were no manual acts prescribed and no adequate words provided, therefore there was no consecration, and the whole service was an empty unreality.

When it came to a division, nine lay and nine spiritual peers voted against the bill, and it was carried by the small majority of three votes: no doubt the proxies of those that were absent had to be taken into account, and it is not safe to argue that the "contents" numbered only one and twenty; but, even when allowance is made for proxies, it seems probable that little more than half the number of lay peers voted at all.

The business of the session drew to a close; the Uniformity Bill was ended on April 28, the Supremacy Bill the next day, three other bills took up the first week in May, and on the 8th the queen came quietly by water to the House of Lords in the afternoon to close the session. ^{and the session.} By the mouth of her Lord Keeper she congratulated parliament on the deliberation and toleration which had marked its business, she gave her thanks for the subsidies granted, and spoke of the execution of the good

new laws which was now necessary to secure peace, justice, and religious uniformity "both among those that be too swift and those that be too slow." She then gave her assent to some forty acts of parliament, either public or private, and so her first parliament was dissolved.

AUTHORITIES.—The *Journals* of parliament are meagre for this reign, and must be continually supplemented by D'Ewes, *The Journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 1682. The *State Papers, Venetian* and *Spanish*, throw light on this parliament. The speeches of the prelates are in Strype. The proclamation for Easter communion is in Dr. Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer-Book*. A copy of the official account of the disputation is in *S.P. Dom.* iii. 51; most of it is given in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*. See also Cardwell, *Conferences on the Book of Common Prayer*. The Supremacy Act is discussed in *Engl. Hist. Rev.* xviii. 517. Dr. Gee, *l.c.*, discusses the liturgical changes and propounds original theories not here adopted. On the penal laws in general, see Cawley, *Laws of Q. Elizabeth, K. James, and K. Charles I. concerning Jesuites, etc.*, 1680.

CHAPTER III

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

THE execution of the new laws was, as the Lord Keeper pointed out, the immediate task that lay before the government when parliament rose. The change in the service-book was to take effect finally on Midsummer Day, June 24, 1559, but the six weeks' interval before that date was itself eventful. The first alteration to be effected had been the use of the English litany, which had been begun early in the reign at the queen's chapel, had been extended by the proclamation, and exemplified in parliament itself on the first Sunday in Lent, when "the litany was said by the clerk kneeling, and answered by the whole House (of Commons) on their knees, with divers prayers." The Easter communion had brought fresh changes with it for the moment, and throughout the rest of the session of parliament innovations broke out. For example, a strange burial service was held on April 7, with neither priest nor clerk, but the new preachers habited in their gowns, like laymen, conducted an English service with Genevan metrical psalmody; on St. George's Day the procession of the Knights of the Garter took place without a cross; by the end of April the English service was already in use in Kent.

When parliament rose matters moved on more quickly still: in London crucifixes and images were defaced, altars denuded, and services broken up, at the instigation of a host of scurrilous and blasphemous sheets; and it was probably a matter of prudence to give

up the processions on Corpus Christi Day. Officially also changes took place: no sooner was the Uniformity Bill law, than the holy sacrament was removed from the royal chapel, and some sort of English mass began; this then spread through the parish churches of London after Whitsunday, till at the end of May, still three weeks before the appointed date, all had adopted it. St. Paul's cathedral, however, still stood firm, and at Bishop Bonner's direction kept up the old service in spite of all the efforts of the Council to the contrary, till Bonner was deprived, and a new dean in the person of Alexander Nowell came in on June 11. England copied London, and the prayer-book was in general use long before Midsummer came. This action was greatly due to the influence of the Court, and especially of Grindal's sermon before the Council at Paul's Cross on Whitsunday. His announcement of the restoration of the Edwardine service was hailed with real or pretended rejoicing; but in truth the book was received with mixed feelings, and in some places refused. In the diocese of Winchester mass came to an end at Lady Day; but the clergy refused the new book, and the services ceased; while in the north the refusal was accompanied with some disturbances.

With regard to the execution of the Supremacy Act there was no need for pause, since the Act became operative at once. In order to bring home to the country as a whole the change of system which it had again effected, an oath had been prescribed, to be taken by all present or future office-holders in Church or under the Crown, binding them to the observance of this statute; any one who refused it was to be deprived of his office, whether temporal or ecclesiastical. No such oath was required of persons in general, but any one who set himself in opposition to the Act became liable to a series of penalties reaching finally to those of *præmunire* and high treason.

To administer this oath a commission was issued on May 23, 1559, to a body of eighteen laymen, practically identical with the Council, and soon the conformity of bishops, clergy, justices, etc., began to be tested. The bishops were already in trouble: two had been in prison since the disputation, and others were

The oath
of the
Supremacy
Act

brings the
Marian
bishops into
trouble.

under orders not to leave London. On their refusal to take the oath, Bonner, Bishop of London, was singled out first for deprivation on May 30. He had well earned this distinction both by his prominence in the persecution of Mary's reign and by the way in which he was still holding his cathedral church as a last fortress against the English services: he fled and took sanctuary at Westminster, being, doubtless, one of those who had done most to raise the violent ill-feeling which was now being displayed by the London populace against the Marian bishops. On the other hand, many were full of admiration for the constancy which the prelates displayed in withstanding the pressure put upon them by the Council to induce them to take the oath. Their refusal found not only sympathy, but even a measure of support from some of the lawyers, who were said to have evaded the oath themselves and to have questioned the legality of the proceedings with the bishops. No attempt was made to hurry matters either with the ecclesiastics or the lawyers: the oath was being tendered to the justices in the first half of June, and arrangements were being made by them for the introduction of the service-book into each parish, and for the detection and punishment before the lord-lieutenant of any clergy who might prove recalcitrant.

The bishops were apparently given three weeks in which to think over their refusal: these were anxious weeks for the government, since the opposition was stout, and scorned both threats and promises. Moreover, it was said that the Council itself was divided, and that Lord-Keeper Bacon, a timorous man, was terrified at the magnitude of the resistance in the country, where religious discontent was beginning to take the political shape of questioning Elizabeth's legitimacy and her claim to the throne. On June 21 five bishops were summoned to the Council, and, on their refusal to take the oath, were deprived; the formal sentence, it appears, was given a week later on the 26th, when the two bishops who had been imprisoned—White of Winchester and Watson of Lincoln—were associated with the other five; they were made to give security that they would not leave England, nor even quit London until after September, and were warned that any speech or writing contrary to the

law would consign them to perpetual imprisonment. Another interval passed, and then on July 5 the same fate befell Archbishop Heath and Bishop Thirlby of Norwich.

So far eleven bishops had been dealt with and ten had been deprived: the eleventh, Kitchin of Llandaff, had gone a long way with the rest, but he had not refused the oath as yet; and it was noticed that whereas he had in the earlier stages of the negotiations put off his episcopal dress with the rest, he now resumed it. The Spanish ambassador did his best to encourage him to persist in refusal, but on the 18th his oath was postponed on his undertaking to administer it to others in his diocese: thus his case was settled at any rate for a time, and the Council breathed again. Six bishops, however, still remained unaccounted for, and there were hopes still that these might conform; they were specially centred on the venerable and liberal-minded Tunstall, who was summoned to London in July, and seemed at first amenable: on August 10 two of the remainder fell, leaving only Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pole of Peterborough, and Stanley of Sodor and Man, to keep company with Tunstall among the doubtful quantities. But meanwhile there was a tornado of change sweeping over the country which was bound to influence their decision.

Arrangements had for some time been maturing for the speedy exercise of the power of visitation, recovered for the Crown by the Supremacy Act, as soon as Midsummer came and the Uniformity Act became operative. Soon after parliament had risen, England was divided into six districts, one comprising the northern province, and the rest being groups of dioceses in the southern province; lists of names of visitors were drawn up in readiness, and issued at the end of June, embracing in each case the lords-lieutenant of the counties in question, together with other nobles, knights, and gentry of the district. With each set there were associated several legal experts, and one or more theologians who were known to be in sympathy with the changes, and could be trusted to preach accordingly. The principal work of the visitation was to administer the oath and enforce the prayer-book; but as there were many details in the "change of religion" which were not covered by acts of

The
doubtful
quantities.

The royal
visitation,
June 1559.

parliament, arrangements were also made for a series of ecclesiastical injunctions, together with articles of inquiry, to be enjoined upon the country by royal authority. For convenience' sake a comprehensive oath was devised which included the other points as well as the supremacy, and bound the recipient not only to "acknowledge the restoring of the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown and the abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same," but also to confess and acknowledge the Book of Common Prayer and the royal injunctions exhibited in the present visitation to be according to the true word of God, and agreeable to the doctrine of the primitive Church.

There was very clear precedent for this last device, as well as for the supremacy and the uniformity, since royal visitations had taken place in Henry's time, and again under Edward in 1547; indeed the articles and injunctions now issued were based upon those of 1547, but were brought up to date by alterations, omissions, and large additions. Parallel with these there was issued a set of visitation questions, fifty-six in number, also based on the Edwardine precedent, but following it less closely. Among the points which were specially enforced by this method the following are specially to be noted. The old precautions were renewed against images, relics, and miracles; care was taken for preaching and Bible-reading, and the instruction both of clergy and laity; the old prohibition was renewed against processions abroad and the use of the litany in procession, though now for the first time an exception was made in favour of the "perambulations" at Rogation tide. The other new provisions are of greater interest still. Regulations were included for the marriage of the clergy, and no one, not even a bishop, was allowed to marry without first having his chosen partner examined and approved by bishop, justices, and metropolitan or other superior authority. It is not clear how long this strange provision lasted, though it was certainly in working order till the middle of the reign. The next one following had a fiercer and longer history: it ordered that "the prelacy and clergy," together with learned societies at the universities and elsewhere, should wear the traditional priestly dress as worn in the latter year of Edward VI.: this

included the cassock, gown, and priest's square cap. Other provisions throw a curious light on the Marian reaction. Its failure to enlist the sympathies of the abler men is shown by the order that ignorant priests are not to be admitted to cures, and its reign of terror is recalled by the provision for a certificate to be made of the sufferings lately undergone for religion. Much attention was given to the important question of the instruction of children both at church and by licensed teachers at school. All printing was to be licensed before publication, and all religious disputation was forbidden.

Lastly, a number of injunctions concerned the church service and the churches. Church attendance was demanded of every one at the church of his own parish: overseers were appointed to enforce it, and to ^{Changes as to church service.} denounce recusants. Order was to be jealously kept in time of service and sermon; all were to be occupied meanwhile with nothing else but attention to the service, *i.e.* the old custom of saying private prayers from a primer or other such book was entirely discouraged. But the old customs of reverence were to be kept up, among which were specially mentioned kneeling for prayer, and "due reverence with lowliness of courtesy and uncovering of heads of the mankind" when the name of Jesus is pronounced. The old simple plainsong singing was encouraged; part-music was allowed, and the singing of hymns and anthems, especially where there were choral foundations, on condition that the music did not make the words unintelligible. All shrines, pictures, paintings, and other monuments of superstition were to be destroyed, not only in churches, but in private houses, and an inventory of all vestments, ornaments of the church, and Latin service-books was to be delivered by the churchwardens to the visitors.

The injunctions closed with four appended directions. The last of these provided a new form for the bidding prayer, fuller and richer than the Edwardine form, beginning with the definite prayer for "Christ's Holy Catholic Church," where the Edwardine prayer had been vague, but ending with a vague ^{The directions appended to the injunctions,} commemoration of the departed, instead of the definite prayer of 1547. The second and third directions were of more

crucial importance still. The altars were to be taken down, not in the riotous and disordered manner which had been used in some places, but authoritatively by curate and churchwardens; and the visitors were to give directions for the setting of the holy table in the old place, except in so far as it was found convenient to move it to some other position in the chancel during the time when communion was given. The rubric in the prayer-book sanctioning the use of ordinary bread at communion was superseded by a new direction that instead wafer-bread should be used, of the old sort, but plain and somewhat thicker than in the old days.

The first of these appended directions has been reserved for discussion to the last, because it was in a sense an interpretative clause defining the whole value of the injunctions and the nature of the royal supremacy. including an exposition of royal supremacy. Under the heading *An admonition to simple men deceived by malicious*, it gave a pacific and conciliatory explanation of the meaning of the royal supremacy as now resumed by Elizabeth. No new authority was claimed, and no "power of ministry of divine offices in the Church,"—only the ancient sovereignty of the Crown over all its subjects, ecclesiastical and temporal, without interference from foreign power. The people are not to be induced "by sinister persuasion or perverse construction" "to find some scruple in the form of the oath," but are to take it in this sense. This important addition was drafted by Cecil and issued with the injunctions, to meet the outcry which the Marianists were attempting to raise against the supremacy by exaggeration and misinterpretation, and to assure the country that the queen was claiming even less than her predecessors had done. In the hurry of change many persons either could not or would not see the difference between the title "Supreme Head," which Edward and Henry had used, and even Mary had tolerated for the moment, and the title "Supreme Governor," which Elizabeth had taken. But the more level-headed could see that, though the statement might, as Parker protested on his deathbed, lend itself somewhat to exaggeration, yet the visitation itself was a typical example of the due exercise of royal supremacy.

The Crown was only claiming now what the Crown had

claimed in the times of Justinian and Charlemagne, no less than in the days of Saxon Edward or Norman William, viz. a visitatorial power, or, in other words, ^{Its} justification the right or responsibility of securing that the ecclesiastical system, as defined by the Church's laws and administered by the Church's officers, should be in effective working order. The strength of the position was that the visitation was a valuable method of restoring order into the system of the Church at a moment of disorder. The weakness of the position, and a very serious weakness not to be disguised, lay in this, that the visitation was carrying into execution laws to which the Church had given no assent, and enforcing them in the teeth of the existing bishops and chief officers of the Church.

While cruder scruples about the supremacy itself were disturbing the Marian mind, it was this scruple, not against the supremacy itself, so much as against this use of it, which beset the mind of lawyers. They, as has been ^{and legal position.} stated, were questioning the legality of the proceedings with the bishops, on the ground that they were made the victims of laws which concerned the ecclesiastical polity, but which they, the ecclesiastical authorities, had never accepted on behalf of the Church. The lawyers' scruple was perfectly justified—the proceedings were irregular; the ecclesiastical changes of both the Supremacy Act and the Uniformity Act ought, properly speaking, to have received that "assent of the clergy in their convocation" which the Supremacy Act itself recognised to be the proper authorisation, reinforced if need be by a ratification of parliament, in questions of ecclesiastical legislation. But the exceptional circumstances of the time demanded exceptional procedure; it was not possible that the survivors of a spent reaction could withstand the flowing tide of reform. A religious revolution, like any other revolution, must risk technical illegalities, and be content to do exceptional things in the confidence that the event will justify them.

It is always difficult exactly to define the frontier between Church and State, but at any rate Cecil and Elizabeth knew as well as any one in the kingdom at what point in this policy they crossed the Rubicon; and they anxiously watched the course of the visitation to see whether their action would be justified and ^{The results of the visitation in general.}

their calculations verified. As regarded the oath, what would be the amount of refusal among clergy and laity? and as regarded the change of religion, how far would the parishes be ready to "deliver the altars and images and receive" the new service-book?—for so Cecil summarised the dealings of the visitors with the parishes. The result exceeded their hopes, one may suppose; for while the Edwardine changes of 1549 had produced risings in several parts of the country, and the Marian changes had involved the ejection of something like one-third of the clergy of the parishes, the crisis of 1559 passed off without disturbance, and by gentleness and judicious management the cases of hardship and of actual deprivation of the clergy were kept down to a quite inconsiderable figure: in the first six years of the reign no more than 400 are recorded to have been deprived for all causes, and of these probably not more than half were Marians.

It is, however, worth while to trace out in greater detail some features of the visitation. The fullest information is available

Its method. for the northern province, where proceedings began in Nottingham on August 22 with service at St. Mary's and a sermon from Sandys. Then he and his fellow visitors—two knights and a lawyer—took their place in the chancel and opened the formalities. The afternoon was spent in receiving presentments from the churchwardens, together with the inventory of church goods and ornaments; in examining the clergy individually as to their learning, conversation, and qualifications; and in administering the oath. Sixteen sessions were held altogether at eleven different centres in the great diocese of York, and the method of procedure was the same. To some extent the visitors dealt with ordinary cases of ecclesiastical discipline, corrected moral offenders, decided matrimonial causes, etc.; but work of this kind could only have been lightly touched upon, for only three weeks were spent over the whole of this part of the task; and besides the usual duty of noting vacancies, or instituting to them, the visitors were also engaged in restoring to their cures those who had been deprived for marriage in Mary's reign. This task, as well as many others no doubt, was to a considerable extent left incomplete. On September 21 the visitors, after holding one session for part of the diocese of Chester, went on

to the diocese of Durham, where five sessions were held in the remaining days of the month. The last of these was held by deputies, and two deputies were constituted in the diocese to complete what was still unfinished. Three sessions sufficed for the diocese of Carlisle; but six more were necessary, besides two held by deputies, before the huge diocese of Chester was dealt with, and Sandys and his three colleagues, on whom had fallen almost the whole burden of the visitation, were free to go to their homes again.

The returns of the churchwardens give some insight into the condition of things in the parishes. There are many reports of the decay of the churches, and of the want of services and curates. The registers were ^{The state of the north.} not kept in Mary's reign. Some complaints are made of backwardness in adopting the changes; several clergy have refused to use the vernacular prayers and scriptures as ordered by the proclamation (the prayer-book is hardly in question yet), or have read them unintelligibly. At Doncaster and Bridlington the images are not destroyed. At Bainton "the image of our Lady hath been used for pilgrimage," and in York Minster "the altars stand still, all saving the high altar." Not only is there gross immorality to be corrected, but Hull desires to be delivered from two scolds, while Bridlington suffers from seven scolds and unquiet women.

More important still is the question of the oath. A list of absentees shows that about one-quarter of the parochial clergy failed to present themselves in the diocese of York, a lower proportion in Durham, but a higher proportion in Chester and Carlisle: the number amounted ^{The oath-taking.} to some three hundred, but allowance must be made for the prevalent sickness, and it does not appear that more than a dozen were subsequently deprived. Some who presented themselves refused to take the oath, denied the supremacy, and would not subscribe *susceptae religioni*. There was considerable opposition in the chapter at York; the refusers there, as elsewhere, were given time for consideration, and bound over to reappear at a later session: in the end only two who were present and four absentees were deprived. The opposition among the parochial clergy of the diocese was

comparatively small; but it broke out again when the visitors faced the chapter of Durham: man after man protested in almost the same terms "that the Bishop of Rome ought to have the jurisdiction within this realm," and seven were bound over to appear again: but again the parochial clergy were far more conformable. In the dioceses of Carlisle and Chester only one case of refusal is reported. On the whole, the visitors could report that the "change of religion" had, so far as this province was concerned, been accepted by all except a small minority of the prelacy.

In the southern province the visitors had set to work earlier; but only very incomplete evidence of their proceedings is extant, and this shows that in the

London

main the course of events was much the same as in the north. On the other hand, there is more side light available. At St. Paul's cathedral the visitors gave explicit instructions for the destruction of images, crosses, and altars, and for the erection of a holy table in their place. They went on also beyond their province to order the discontinuance of tonsures, copes, and almuces. As to the latter group, their directions were not obeyed, but the former order was soon executed, not only at St. Paul's but in the parish churches too. At St. Bartholomew's Fair in Smithfield as well as in Cheapside, St. Paul's Churchyard, and other places, great bonfires were made of roods and images. London, being all on this side, exulted in the novel *auto da fé*; but it was a disgraceful proceeding, and the report of it caused much comment abroad. Even those who regarded the change as necessary thought the manner of it reprehensible. In other places the copes, vestments, and other legal ornaments were also burnt, in defiance of the Act of Uniformity. So the first signs of nonconforming puritanism made their appearance under the evil and tumultuous omens of an outburst of sacrilege which raged unchecked for three weeks and more.

Outside London matters went more quietly, and the visitors met with more opposition, though not so much as might have been expected. Jewel, on his return from the western dioceses, where he was visitor, reported that the people everywhere were sufficiently well disposed towards religion, in spite of the wilderness of super-

and the
southern
province.

stitution that had grown up, and the supply of new relics of the Passion and of the saints that the Marian demand had created.

Here, as in the north, the cathedral bodies were the most obdurate. A special set of injunctions had been prepared for them, based, like the other injunctions, on Edwardine precedent; and these were given, with suitable ^{The} variations, to the different chapters for their amendment. Stress was laid upon preaching, lecturing, study, and the provision of a library of patristic and other theology. Provision was made for communion every Sunday, and for a daily morning service, over and above the usual daily prayer, to begin, like the old morning mass, at five or six o'clock, and to consist of the confession and absolution, followed by the litany, with a lesson from the New Testament inserted at the break before "O Lord, arise, help us," etc. At Exeter the hour for morning prayer was to be eight o'clock. Another service followed at nine; this consisted of the *Veni Creator* sung in plainsong, a divinity lecture, or a reading from Erasmus' *Paraphrases*, with the Lord's Prayer sung by the choir in English and a closing collect. At ten the vicars and choristers reassembled once again, and the communion was to be begun by the "hebdomader" or priest of the week.

These orders form an interesting commentary on the Act of Uniformity, and the sequel throws further light upon it. The exiles when they left England took with them ^{The elasticity of the Act of Uniformity.} the first part of the English metrical psalter; at Geneva they came into contact with its French counterpart, the work of Marot and Beza, and under its influence they completed the English psalter, long to be known by the names of the two principal translators, Sternhold and Hopkins. As early as April 4 they had caused some surprise in London by singing *Pater noster* in English after a new fashion at a funeral; thenceforward the use of the metrical psalms spread rapidly, and was bound soon to be confronted with the Uniformity Act. In December some Londoners who had come to St. Nicholas' Fair invaded the choir of Exeter cathedral, accompanied by some citizens of the town; and, encouraged perhaps by the directions that the visitors had given for the nine o'clock service, they sang metrical

psalms at the early morning service, men and women together, unbidden and unlicensed, and to the great disturbance of the ministers of the church in the aforesaid prayers. The chapter warned the ringleaders of this conspiracy that they were directly contravening the act, but they persisted nevertheless, and ousted the vicars from their seats. The visitors, being appealed to by the innovators, admonished the chapter to allow the singing, and to direct their vicars and other priests to cease scoffing and assist the people in their singing. The chapter in reply pleaded the strict nature of the statute as good reason for their opposition; but finally the ecclesiastical commissioners in London, when the appeal came to them, settled the point in favour of the metrical psalms, and established a precedent which has been fruitful of results ever since. The elasticity of the act in certain directions was also shown by other services which were held at this time, notably the services of the Order of the Garter, held at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and the dirge and communion used in St. Paul's cathedral at the death of Henry II. of France; the divergence from the prayer-book was marked in both cases, and forms of service quite other than those there provided were used by the bishops-elect and other responsible persons.

The visitation came to an end in October, and arrangements had been made beforehand to form the permanent and stationary ecclesiastical commission provided for in the act, to which the visitors handed over whatever remained unfinished of their task. On July 19, 1559, the queen called it into being by her letters-patent. The first members were three ecclesiastics—Parker and Grindal, soon to be Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London respectively, and Dr. Bill, the royal almoner, with eight lawyers and eight lay persons. Their duty was to exercise the visitatorial power of the Crown in matters ecclesiastical, and especially to execute the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, to enforce church attendance and church order, to restore those who had been unjustly deprived, and to deal with all ecclesiastical crimes and offences. To this was added, by a later document of October 20, in which Richard Cox, soon to be Bishop of Ely, was also appointed a

The permanent and central ecclesiastical commission.

commissioner, the further duty of administering the oath as had been done by the visitors. The ecclesiastical commission began its work in November, and after dealing with the business that remained over from the visitation, then started its career on its own account.

Meanwhile the fate of the four undecided Marian bishops was trembling in the balance, and in one case at any rate it was profoundly affected by the course events had taken this autumn. Little is known of the dealings with Bourne and Pole except that they were deprived, probably in November, by the ecclesiastical commission. Still less is known of Stanley, Bishop of Sodor and Man, except that he held his bishopric till his death in 1570. He stands, therefore, with Kitchin of Llandaff, and they are the only Marian bishops who conformed. The case of Bishop Tunstall is intrinsically more interesting and is better known. He came up from his diocese to London, in spite of his eighty-five years, on July 20, 1559, and was shocked with what he saw there. He was no favourer of the papacy, as his past history had showed; he had defended Henry's action on the ground that it involved no change of faith; he had gone as far as he could with doctrinal reform under Edward, until he saw it lead to iconoclasm and sacrilege; and now history was repeating itself. He seems to have been prepared to accept both supremacy and service-book; but he protested that he could not in conscience consent to the pulling down of altars and defacing of churches in his diocese, nor could he himself become a sacramentary or approve of the teaching of new doctrine. His expostulation with the queen and Cecil delayed matters somewhat, and hopes were cherished, even after Bourne and Pole had been deprived, that he would conform. Some conference with Parker at Lambeth gave momentary encouragement to these hopes, but in the first week of October the die was cast: Tunstall refused to conform, and was deprived; six weeks later he died.

The filling of the vacant sees was now an urgent question: in every diocese but two, episcopal supervision had ceased ever since May or June, and though some bishops had carried on their administration, and even their ordinations, as late as that, diocesan work was dis-

Further
episcopal
deprivations.

The
Elizabethan
hierarchy.

organised. During the visitation the normal jurisdiction had as usual been suspended, but, now that this was over, it was the more necessary that the new bishops should take up the reins of government. The choice of Parker to fill the archiepiscopal see has already been recorded; but his consecration, which was to be the next step in the filling up of the vacancies, was delayed for some time by two causes—one financial and one ecclesiastical. The arrangements for the exchange of land and endowment with the Crown according to the recent Act did not reach their final stage till September 13, when the commissioners were appointed to adjudicate on the exchanges: even then matters dragged on till the end of October, when Parker and his colleagues made their petition and protest with regard to the details of the negotiations. The queen thereupon directed that they should be dealt with more equitably, and that the arrangements should speedily be concluded.

Parker had been elected by the chapter of Canterbury on August 1, 1559. It was noticeable that the desperate expedient sanctioned by parliament for the filling of the vacancies was not adopted; a return was made, not to the novel Edwardine method of appointing bishops by mere letters-patent and on their good behaviour, but to the old constitutional method of the Church. This comprised two chief points: first came the election by the chapter, held under the restrictions from the side of the Crown which were customary in England, and had been recently regulated in Henry's time, viz. subject to the royal *congé d'élire*, the royal letter missive of nomination, and writ of royal assent to the election when made; then came the metropolitical or provincial confirmation of the election, which had also recently been defined by the Henrician legislation. The election of Parker had been easily arranged; the confirmation of the election by the province and the further essential ceremony of consecration were more difficult to secure. On September 9 a royal writ was issued to six bishops according to precedent, empowering them to confirm the election and to consecrate Parker. The three hesitating Marian bishops were included, in the hope that they would act with Kitchin of Llandaff, and with Barlow

Difficulties in
securing the
succession.

and Scory, who had been deprived of their sees under Mary. When the three hesitating Marians were deprived, the difficulties of the situation were increased. A valuable official memorandum annotated by Parker and Cecil shows the two chief perplexities of the government. "There is no archbishop nor four bishops now to be had": the Edwardine service "is not established by parliament." So Cecil noted, and indeed it was true that, technically speaking, the Ordinal was a separate book from the prayer-book, and by inadvertence it had not been named in the Act of Uniformity. Still it was necessary to go forward somehow; and to meet the circumstances a new and special writ was issued on December 6, in which the places of the deprived Marians were taken by Miles Coverdale, the Edwardine Bishop of Exeter, the celebrated John Bale, Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, and two suffragans, Hodgkin of Bedford and Salisbury of Thetford. The confirmation followed at Bow Church, Cheapside, on December 9, and the consecration in Lambeth Palace on December 17.

The circumstances have received more attention than, in spite of their great intrinsic importance, they can be said to deserve, owing to a singularly ill-advised attack made upon them by the Roman controversialists, and owing to the romantic fable of the consecration at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside, which has played a ludicrously large part in the controversy. It would be difficult to name an event of the sort which is better attested than Parker's consecration: extraordinary caution was used at every stage, and extraordinary care was taken that no shadow of doubt might rest upon it. For example, in issuing the commission to the seven bishops for his confirmation and consecration, a special clause was inserted—*supplentes nihilominus*, etc.—to supply by royal authority any possible legal defects that might arise from the unusual facts of the case. There were two especially in view, viz. those that Cecil had noted in the memorandum, as to the defective status both of the Ordinal and of the bishops; for only one, or possibly two, had actual possession of a diocesan see, and consequently the legality of the proceeding from the civil point of view might be questioned. Each of the two in question—Kitchin, and Bale also, as it proved—was absent

Elaborate
attestation
of Parker's
consecration.

from the execution of the writ. Further, there was added to the writ, in order to satisfy the commissioners that they would be held blameless, a formal opinion signed by six leading lawyers and divines that all was in due order, and might rightly be carried out. Again the records of the whole process were elaborately drawn up, inserted in the archbishop's register, and laid up in duplicate among his papers, which came subsequently to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The same precaution was carried into the consecration itself, for all the four bishops simultaneously repeated the crucial formulæ in the service.

The contemporary record of the ceremony gives a vivid idea of the scene: it was early morning and dark, between

five and six o'clock in midwinter, when Parker
The ceremony,
 Dec. 17, 1559. entered the chapel, preceded by four taperers. The four bishops took their places on the south side of the altar, and the archbishop-elect, in his doctor's habit, on the north side. The chaplain began mattins, and, when that was said, Scory preached: then they retired to vest for the communion service, and returned through the north door, Barlow with two archdeacons, Bullingham and Guest, as his deacon and subdeacon, all habited in copes; Scory, Hodgkin, and Parker in surplices, and Coverdale vested only in his cassock. After the gospel, Barlow was seated before the holy table, and the three other bishops presented Parker to him; the writ was read by Dr. Yale, the oath was taken by Parker, the litany sung by the choir, and the rest of the service of the Ordinal continued as has been described: the new archbishop communicated with the other bishops and some others who were present. When the service was done, they left the chapel, some in rochets and black chimeres, and some in cassocks, and the archbishop was solemnly escorted on his way by his household.

Three days later six further elections were confirmed, and on December 21 the four who were as yet only in priest's orders

—Grindal of London, Cox of Ely, Meyrick of Bangor, and Sandys of Worcester—were consecrated by

Further consecrations. Parker at Lambeth, with the assistance of Barlow, Scory, and Hodgkin; a month later four more bishops were consecrated, including Jewel, the new bishop of Salisbury;

and at the end of March 1560 a further set of three. Thus sixteen out of the twenty-seven dioceses were by then provided with pastors; and normal ecclesiastical government could once again take the place of the exceptional methods which the emergencies of the crisis had made necessary.

Already before the end of December the Council had advised the queen that the time had come for remitting the governance of the Church to the clergy, and was eager, on constitutional grounds certainly, and perhaps on practical grounds also, to return the reins into the hands which ought to hold them. Thus the bishops set out on their charge, with a difficult task, and a very uncertain future before them.

Resumption
of normal
Church
government.

AUTHORITIES.—*Machyn's Diary* (Camden Soc.) gives many details as to services; see also in the same series Wriothesley's *Chronicle* ending September 1559. To the official *State Papers* add also the *Privy Council Acts*. The action of the justices in June 1559 is described in Strype's *Smith*, ch. vii. For the dealings with Kitchin see Bramhall, *Works* (Anglo-Cath. Libr.), iii. 178 n. The visitation of 1559 is well handled in Dr. Gee's *Elizabethan Clergy*. The records of the northern province are in *S.P. Dom.* vol. x. For the cathedrals see Mr. Reynold's, *The Use of Exeter Cathedral*, and Dayman and Jones, *Sarum Statutes*. For a priest's license to marry see Kempe, *Loseley MSS.* p. 254, and Parker's Register, i. 205, 298. The services of the Knights of the Garter are in *S.P. Dom.* xxxiii. 68; cp. v. 12. For Bishop Stanley see Bp. Collins, *English Reformation*, p. 65. For Tunstall see Bridget and Knox, *Queen Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy*. Estcourt, *Anglican Ordinations*, has facsimiles of some documents relating to Parker's consecration, but the question is better handled by Haddan in Bramhall's *Works* (Anglo-Cath. Libr.), iii.; or briefly by Messrs. Denny and Lacey, in *De Hierarchia Anglicana*.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNAL AFFAIRS (1560-1562)

It is hard for a modern reader to grasp the intimacy of the connexion between political and ecclesiastical policy in Elizabeth's reign, or to estimate the state of complex uncertainty in all public affairs which resulted therefrom. The bearing of foreign politics Already instances have shown how the course of religion was affected both by home and foreign politics, and the same phenomenon is still to be looked for. The balance of European power for a long time depended on a hollow alliance between England and Spain; and Philip, for hatred and fear of France, was obliged to control his ardent fanaticism and protect a protestant queen. Elizabeth in her turn was obliged to be still more cautious: Philip's friendship was very necessary because it alone prevented the pope from declaring against her and rallying the disaffected in religion within the kingdom to a standard of rebellion: for the time her position on the throne was only secured in this way. On the other hand, such an alliance could not be lasting, and in the near future a more real security would need to be assured by an alliance with the protestant countries; but the transition from one to the other was a risky proceeding even to contemplate. Meanwhile, over the border Scotland presented fresh problems from the uncertainty of the position of affairs there. So long as it remained the close ally of France its influence in European politics might be calculated with comparative ease; but how long would the Calvinists maintain such a state of things? Scotland, when once divorced from France, and protestant, would obviously become the natural

ally of England, and no longer its traditional foe. Lastly, even France was a quantity hard to reckon upon; for there, as in Philip's dominions in the Netherlands, the contest between Romanist and protestant was at its height, and no one could foretell on which side the advantage would ultimately lie. Thus every move of foreign politics was at the bottom dominated by the religious question, and every fluctuation had some effect upon the religious position in England.

At home the same ticklish uncertainty reigned. Even when the religious policy of the government—that is, of the queen and Cecil—had been defined and imposed by the two great Acts of parliament and the royal ^{and domestic prospects.} visitation, there was little visible prospect of permanence; indeed this policy seemed to have less chance of ultimate victory than either of its rivals—the Marian policy or the Genevan. To both of these parties a protestant catholicism seemed contemptible; not because it seemed a contradiction in terms, for as yet the perversion of terms had not taken place which made the term “protestant” the antithesis to “catholic” instead of to “papist,” but because it seemed a mere hybrid that could have no posterity. For the Marian there could be no catholicism without the pope; for the Genevan a protestantism which retained catholic doctrine and worship was no better than popery: a brief experience of Edwardine religion had brought each to his own conclusion, and the modification of the Edwardine religion, which was now put forward, satisfied neither, for it sought to place the centre of gravity of English religion in England, while they were alike in locating it abroad.

It was the salvation of England that, at such a crisis, the decision rested in no more than two pairs of hands, each of which played into the other and was master of its own craft. Elizabeth had by nature her father's ^{The queen and her minister.} genius for statecraft, and the very disadvantages of her early life had trained it to a high degree. While she made herself the permanently indeterminable factor in foreign politics, and so kept the balance in her hands, at home she immediately won the enthusiastic affection of her people; she kept their heart, read it unflinching, and never lost it. In Cecil she had a man's calculating caution to balance her own

feminine intuition: his genius ballasted the boat while she held the helm.

Two matters of direct personal interest to the queen give the earliest illustrations of the result of this alliance. The first

is the question of her marriage. It was an urgent question from the beginning: as princess she had

Her views on matrimony only barely escaped marriage, and from the day when

she was seated on the throne there was never a moment when the question of succession was not pressing. The queen's

handling of the matter was highly characteristic; her courtships were her diplomatic trump cards; she knew it well, and determined to make the most of them. To her first parliament she declared her intention of remaining a virgin queen.

This may have been no more a true statement of her views than many others; and, indeed, at the time it seemed only a

clever show of modesty; but subsequent events proved its truth, and it may have been a piece of candour after all.

Probably the queen had already realised that, even if she married, her hopes of giving birth to a son were small; and,

locking the secret in her own bosom, had determined to look upon the prospect of marriage merely as a diplomatic asset.

In many ways this question of marriage formed a link between foreign politics and home ecclesiastical policy; thus, while the

Spanish support needed security, the queen favoured a catholic claimant for her hand, just as later diplomatic

relations with France made a French prince an eligible suitor. Meanwhile ecclesiastical affairs followed suit: the queen

expressed her interest in the Council of Trent, said that she herself really held the old faith, dealt gently with imprisoned

Marians, and so forth. On the other hand, when favour had to be made with reforming Scotland, or it was wise to rouse

the sluggish Philip of Spain by coquetting with his rebellious and protestant Netherlands, the queen equally easily said the

contrary as to her own beliefs, and encouraged other matrimonial plans; and her ecclesiastical policy at home was

framed accordingly.

Not only matrimonial but also religious views were also

and religion. parts of statecraft. A wedding was to take place

in the royal chapel on October 5, 1559, and the order came from the queen that a crucifix and two candles

should be placed upon the altar. This caused so much disturbance both among the chaplains and in the Council that the change was postponed; but it took place on Saturday the 7th; and, to make the excitement greater, the eucharistic vestments were worn on the Sunday following. These ornaments were not illegal, for a clause in the Uniformity Act had expressly provided for them; but since the passing of the act England had seen royal commissioners going through the land and the people bringing out ornaments and vestments to them as things defiled by idolatry and superstition, with the result that, on that ground, and not because the ornaments were illegal, bonfires of church goods had blazed wherever the spirit of reform was strong. Not unnaturally it was claimed by many that such things were banished for ever; and the news of their restoration in the royal chapel brought together a great crowd, and threatened to create a disturbance. It has been thought that such a restoration represented the queen's own religious convictions, and such may be the case; but religious convictions with Elizabeth, as with Philip and other leaders in the religious contest, were continually subordinated to other considerations; and the reason for Elizabeth's move may with far greater probability be discerned in the fact that a catholic suitor was on the horizon in the person of the Archduke Charles of Austria, and indeed was even now expected. Protests against this action were at once made by clergy and laity alike, in which Parker, now elect of Canterbury, took a leading part. By November the question had become urgent; conferences were being held with the queen, and there were fears of a popular tumult if the "offendicle" or stumbling-block was not removed. For the moment the queen seemed inclined to yield; but she soon resisted all remonstrances, and "that little cross of ill-omened origin" maintained its place in the queen's chapel till the end of the year, though the example was not followed elsewhere.

The storm broke out again in January 1560, after the consecration of the bishops, for three of them were appointed "to officiate at the table of the Lord, one as a priest, another as a deacon, and a third as subdeacon," ^{The scandal of the chapel royal.} before the crucifix and candles, "habited in the golden vestments of the papacy"—a pompous phrase which

here probably means no more than copes. Cox, Bishop of Ely, who was probably one of the three selected, sent a piteous protest to the queen, asking to be excused; and a number of other clergy presented to her a long formal statement of their objections, which has been fathered upon Parker, but more probably was inspired by Jewel. Meanwhile advice was sought from protestant leaders abroad as to whether or no such conduct was allowable as "a thing in itself indifferent." When the answer came in the negative, matters were again forced to a crisis. It was expected that on the one side the queen would order the general restoration of the destroyed crosses and altars, and that the bishops and clergy on their side would refuse; and be deprived of their positions. A disputation took place upon the subject on February 5. Parker and Cox, who had hitherto opposed, were now apparently prepared to counsel submission to authority on the point, while Grindal and Jewel contended against them, risking their bishoprics upon the result of the conflict. The result was not momentous; the cross and the bishops alike remained where they were; but it seems that the point at issue had by this time changed, and what was now in question was the restoration in the churches of the rood-image with Mary and John. It was now Cox's turn to consult foreign authorities, and to get from the Lutheran scholar George Cassander some toleration of the project. But the final victory fell to the opposite side: the queen retained her own ways in her chapel: the roods were not restored to the churches, the lofts themselves were adapted to the new state of things and repaired from the violence done to them at the destruction of the images; and the reforming party, thankful to have escaped this peril, was content to leave the queen and her offendicle in peace.

Closely bound up with this was the question of the ornaments of the minister, or more largely of the dress of the clergy, both in and out of church; for both were in dispute. This vestiarian contest had begun under

Renewal of
the vestiarian
conflict.

Edward in the scruples of Bishop Hooper and the tragi-comedy that resulted from them. Hooper's example was now quoted on both sides; the Genevans pointed to his refusals as model protests against the vestments of Baal, while the conformists cited his latter end as an edifying example of

conformity in things indifferent. The returned exiles had come back from abroad accustomed to the foreign ways of Frankfort or Geneva, where a surplice met with no favour: they found themselves bound to the old vestments and ornaments—chasubles, copes, and the whole of the “popish wardrobe”; whereas they themselves had come to look on even the surplice or the rochet of Edward’s Second Prayer-book as a badge of Rome. Apart from the time of ministration, moreover, the royal injunctions demanded that the old clerical dress should be worn—the cassock, gown, tippet, and square priestly cap; thus they, who had been rejoicing in the gospel freedom of lay attire, were now even in their walks abroad to be marked by the livery of Babylon. Their opposition was so stout that the full enforcement of the clause about ornaments in the Act of Uniformity, now become the ornaments’ rubric of the prayer-book, was never within the bounds of possibility; if it was ever practically contemplated, the wholesale destruction by the commissioners in the visitation of chasubles, tunics, copes, and other “popish gear,” on the ground that they had been superstitiously used, soon put the general observance of the rubric out of the question. Even where the old ornaments were retained it is probable that they were little in use; for, whatever the law might be, the conduct of the commissioners was an object-lesson which no one could afford to disregard.

The policy of the exiles and their followers was soon defined: they assumed from the first, as Sandys wrote to Parker on the passing of the act, that they would not be forced to use them, and would be spared the difficulty by their removal in the queen’s name. ^{Sandys’ gloss on the ornaments’ rubric, Apr. 30, 1559.} This gloss, if it was not semi-official (which is possible, but unlikely), was a very shrewd forecast so far as chasubles were concerned,—far less true if copes were to be included, and very wide of the mark indeed if surplices, which, after all, were as yet on exactly the same footing as chasubles, were also intended by the writer.

Hardly were the Bartlemy-tide bonfires of roods, images, and church goods extinguished in Smithfield and throughout London, and a mild revenge so taken for the grislier burnings of Mary’s reign, than at the memorial service of the French king on September 8, 1559, the bishops-elect began

to set a new fashion ; and Parker, with Scory and Barlow as assistants, conducted the unusual service in gown, hood, and square cap. At the services of the prayer-book, however—the office and communion—copes and surplices were in use ; in this respect the demonstration in the chapel royal in October did not stand alone, for the copes were elsewhere in general use. In the following Lent came a further innovation : the bishops began to preach in rochet and chimere, which had hitherto been regarded merely as forming their outdoor walking-dress ; and the use of this dress as a liturgical dress, though it were only to preach in, was duly remarked and recorded. But the cope remained ; and some of the exiles, who were, or thought themselves to be, trembling on the brink of the episcopate, propounded the whole question of dress as a case of conscience to friends abroad. The advice of Peter Martyr was, that for the present such things, being less shameful than the images, might be tolerated, on the understanding that the wearers would “persist in speaking and teaching against them.” In this way, for the moment, the question was shelved. The bishops had to consider what amount of conformity they could with any prudence try to enforce, and had to keep in view the fact that not a few of their own number, and Jewel at their head, were prepared to sacrifice even the surplice.

The latter part of these proceedings was witnessed by the Marian bishops through the bars of prison windows. No rigours followed upon their deprivations, and the policy of gentleness was remarkable. Their high-placed friends, such as the Spanish ambassador, had anticipated for them nothing less than death as the reward of their constancy, and they themselves, surely in no mock-heroic vein, were declaring themselves ready to die ; but they found themselves at liberty, and so they remained to the end of April 1560. In the interval no less than five had died ; Goldwell had fled abroad : nine were left, but only one of the nine was to remain at liberty. Bonner took precedence of the rest, and was sent to the Marshalsea on April 20, 1560, “for having obstinately refused attendance at public worship, and everywhere declaiming and railing against the existing religion.”

Episcopal
example
introduces
compromise.

The Marian
bishops

In May more strenuous measures were being taken for political reasons with the refusers, or "Recusants," as they now may be called: one of the remaining Marian bishops was committed to the Fleet, and two to the Tower, where they were followed next month by four of their colleagues. Thus at the end of June only David Pole, late of Peterborough, was at liberty: he so continued till his death in 1568, though for a time, for precaution's sake, he was restricted in domicile to the neighbourhood of London. Three years of confinement lay before the rest, and many recriminations have been made on the subject by those who have thought the treatment merciful or the reverse, according to the alternative which they had in view. Certainly Elizabeth's methods were mild as yet in comparison with Mary's, and if these are taken as the alternative, the contrast is all in her favour. Moreover, in view of Pole's treatment it becomes evident that the eight prisoners had only themselves to thank for their imprisonment. The government had made the first of a series of attempts to distinguish between matters of conscience and matters of civil obedience, but, except in Pole's case, it failed; the others went to prison, for conscience' sake as they maintained, for civil disobedience as the government saw the case.

As to their treatment in prison it was clearly lenient, but with periods of greater strictness. The prisoners in the Tower were allowed to join at meals in September 1560, and evidently enjoyed other liberties. Much interest was taken in their case in Roman and Spanish circles, and money was to be sent to them by the pope through the Spanish ambassador; but just about this point, in April 1561, the discovery was made of a letter sent by one of them declaring that through papal and Spanish influence they would soon be free, and in consequence their liberty of intercourse, and this act of the drama, came to an end. When the curtain is again lifted the prisoners in the Tower are again, or still, "close and severally kept," and calling for more liberty: there seems, however, to have been strong reason for giving them less. The summer of 1562 had been full of suspicions about plots and movements on the part of the Recusants, and these had affected once again the position of the prisoners: the Council ordered that they

and their imprisonment again.

were to be more straitly shut up, "so that they may not have such common conference as they have used to have." There had been some "breach of faith," which is not now traceable, but was perhaps some plotting with Sir Francis Englefield abroad. During the rest of the year the popular indignation was growing against the Recusants and the prisoners in the Tower and in the Fleet, till the parliament that was to meet at the beginning of 1563 was called upon to devise more drastic measures, and even to satisfy a clamorous populace with their blood. Their prison experience was no doubt painful: spiritual and temporal penalties were alike tried against them, excommunication as well as other pressure. It seemed for the moment as if worse were to follow, and they were threatened with death if they still refused the oath. Meanwhile the pope was sending messengers who did not arrive, and money which perhaps was equally unfortunate. The time had not come for open hostility: the case of his lieges was piteous, but more fatal to his cause was the fact that the proposal to erect a rival hierarchy by papal authority came to nothing.

Meanwhile the newly consecrated bishops were making their first experiments in episcopal government, and were examining the condition of their dioceses. Great disorder reigned: on the one hand, the licensed preachers were following up the work of the royal visitation, and commending the new order of religion; on the other hand, many of the clergy, "retaining the outward habits and the inward feeling of popery, so fascinated the ears and eyes of the multitude that they were unable to believe but that either the popish doctrine was still retained, or at least that it would be shortly restored." In other places desolation reigned for want of clergy, and itinerant preachers were welcome where the old parish priests were dead or fled; but of these there were only too few, and their task was heavy, since they had to combat not only the old-established views, but also "a large and inauspicious crop of Arians, Anabaptists, and other pests" which had sprung up like mushrooms.

The spiritual destitution was specially great in the north. Horne, Dean of Durham and soon to be Bishop of Winchester, wrote in despair, on February 18, 1560, to Cecil, reporting

much continuance in superstition, much contempt and neglecting of God's service, and pleading for more "workmen." Three prebendaries still refused the oath, ^{The north.} and are officially styled "Recusants." The dioceses which had no bishops were still more destitute. Early in the year Cecil was moving to get the vacancies filled, and in June, when he went on his embassy northward to treat with the Scots, he perceived "a great lack of a bishop of York," and wrote urging that the queen should be induced to pass the *congé d'élire* as soon as possible for Dr. May. But every vacancy meant so much more revenue to the Crown; and the queen was loath to give up this, even though she might find a bishop a useful administrative officer, and, further, might strike a hard bargain with whatever bishop she nominated and impoverish his see both then and subsequently.

A metropolitan visitation of the whole southern province seemed the most promising method of restoring order: the clergy protested on the ground of expense and secured a delay: in the interval there was much to ^{The metro-political visitation in the south:} be prepared. The royal injunctions of 1559 held possession of the field, and were to continue to do so; but the bishops now drew up some *Interpretations and Further Considerations* for securing better order in the Church. The *Interpretations* were five, and concerned preaching, clerical studies, the Rogation processions, and Sunday observance. The *Further Considerations* came to thirty-one: they have the appearance of resolutions made by a body in consultation, rather than of injunctions definitely issued; and they seem to have been framed rather to guide the bishops in the administration of their dioceses than as a public pronouncement.

Some of the points, however, are of considerable public importance. As to the vestments, it was decided, in pressing for uniformity, to require the cope at the communion service, and the surplice in all other minis-^{documents administrative}trations: this was the first definite step downwards to meet the objections of the Genevans. A further concession was made with regard to the position of the holy table, which was now to be brought at communion time, not merely into the chancel, but "into the body of the church

before the chancel door." Careful regulations were also made with regard to the clergy. While much of the old system, of discipline, for example, or of dispensation, was expressly perpetuated, there were new provisions to meet new conditions. Especially this was so with regard to ordinations. The great dearth of clergy which had now existed ever since the middle of Edward's reign had already tempted some to be hasty and injudicious in filling up the vacancies. The new bishops had begun their work with large and frequent ordinations. In his first month Grindal had held four, and ordained a hundred clergy; Parker himself in March had ordained one hundred and fifty on one day. But it was necessary to temper zeal with discretion, and the archbishop, writing to the Bishop of London on August 15, 1560, recognised that in admitting to the ministry "artificers unlearned, and some even of base occupations," they had acted imprudently and given a real ground of complaint to the enemy. The same caution reappears in the *Considerations*: care is to be exercised in regard to unlearned "ministers"; they and their wives are to be well scanned first, and, if their character and biblical knowledge are satisfactory, they may be tolerated in the office of deacon; but they are to be promoted to the priesthood only after a good time of probation.

Some doctrinal testing was also highly necessary, and two dogmatic documents appear at this juncture. The first was called *The Order of the Articles prescribed to Ministers*. It consisted of twenty-three propositions in Latin, nearly all of them derived from the Edwardine Articles of Religion; some however were new, and one of them, treating of the authority of the Church to change or abolish ceremonies and rites, became celebrated later on at the Elizabethan revision of the Articles in 1563. The second document was a *Declaration of the Principal Articles of Religion*, intended to be publicly read by the clergy to their flocks. It comprised eleven long articles in English, the last five of which were highly controversial: they repudiated Roman doctrine as to the papacy, the private mass, and the "pitiatory sacrifice"; they justified communion in both kinds, and the simplified ceremonial of baptism in the prayer-book, which book they declared to be "agreeable to the scriptures,

and to be catholic and apostolic in form and doctrine." This Declaration was probably drawn up at meetings of the episcopate of both provinces, which were being held in March 1561. The Spanish ambassador imagined that the confession of faith which they had in hand was intended for the Council of Trent; but the question of attendance there, though it was for a little while a matter of interest in the diplomatic world, seems never to have penetrated into the ecclesiastical sphere: the queen played with the idea so long as it suited her, but the bishops stood quite apart. Their Declaration was issued in 1561, and did good service, even surviving the issue of the Articles of Religion in 1563, and being published in Ireland in 1566.

While these and some similar but less important documents were being prepared by the bishops for guidance in their difficult task, the metropolitical visitation had got well under way. The royal visitation had already ^{its course,} ^{August 1560;} shown something of the temper of the country: the recovery from the Marian reaction had exhibited its surprising strength, and such a wave of protestant iconoclasm had swept over the country as needed to be controlled and checked even by those to whom it was most welcome. On the other hand, there was much "stoutness," "blindness," and "obstinacy" revealed to the commissioners, and the bishops soon found the same in their dioceses.

The state of things is reflected in the official documents of the visitation. The visitation articles and interrogatories issued for it followed for the most part traditional lines, and resembled similar articles issued by Bonner or Pole; but a contrast is also clear. In some cases ^{in face of} ^{difficulties.} a slight verbal change has made a wide difference: it is the English service and not the Latin that may not be interrupted or avoided, the marriage not the celibacy of priests that may now not be spoken against: it is the unduly ordained intruder from Geneva that is to be warned off—not the unreconciled or undivorced Edwardine priest. Other changes of front are not so simple: among requirements, the prayer-book, Bible, homilies, and paraphrases take the place of the old service-books; a decent table of the old altar; a pulpit and a poor men's box of the "images and other

monuments of idolatry and superstition." But besides the fear that people would cling to abrogated customs, there was a danger that, on the other hand, they would give up what was good and needed little change; so it was emphasised that the clergy must say their daily service, and not "anything otherwise than it is appointed by the common order of the service-book," the clerks must sing a modest and distinct song which did not obscure the sense, the churchwardens must care for the poor and fine absentees from church, the laity must put away business on Sundays, attend church, and behave devoutly.

The metropolitan reserved to himself the visitation of his own cathedral; and he found little to complain of there.

Elsewhere the work was done by commissioners, ^{Canterbury.} and the diocesan bishop as a rule visited as the archbishop's commissioner. The diocese of Canterbury was quieter than it had been when the archdeacon held his visitation in the previous year, and found in several instances curate and churchwardens at issue, the curate saying the new service "darkly and ignorantly" and deriding the metrical psalms, while the churchwardens desired to have their parson use the service of Geneva. The visitation of the cathedrals went on side by side with that of the dioceses, but by different commissioners, and to a certain extent on different lines. The mark of the jointly-prepared documents is on all the proceedings: the articles were distributed, and the "Confession" signed. But to some degree individual visitors added further inquiries and issued their own injunctions.

The additions made by Parkhurst for his own diocese of Norwich contain some points of special interest. In towns

^{Norwich.} where there were several parishes the common prayers were to be finished in each church by nine o'clock on Sunday morning, in order that all might resort to the sermon whenever one was preached. A conservative East Anglian was not to be allowed to have "the Lord's Table hanged and decked like an altar, nor to use the ceremonial of the Latin mass at the time of the communion, as shifting the book, washing, breathing, crossing, or such like." The iconoclasm in this diocese had been overdone, and its ravages were to be repaired; on the other hand, in

the diocese of St. Asaph, it had only been incompletely done, and Bishop Davies had to order its completion: the contrast between the east and the west of the country is here sharply shown, and no doubt extended to other dioceses and to other matters than these.

Apart from the official documents of the visitation there is much valuable evidence to be gleaned as to the state of the country from other sources, and especially from reports which the bishops sent from time to time to Cecil. In the see of Bath and Wells Bishop Berkeley was overwhelmed with his financial diffi-

The state
of other
dioceses,—
Bath and
Wells.

culties (March 7, 1561); not only had the Crown mangled and spoiled the see, but his predecessor, Bourne, foreseeing deprivation, had sought to dissolve the whole bishopric by leases, annuities, reversions, etc. This device had been adopted by several of the Marian bishops; and in this case it was so successful that the poor bishop was almost driven to resign. He remained, however, and even found ultimately enough property in his hands to enable him to follow his predecessor's example by further alienation. The strength of the Marians in the diocese on the one side was unpleasantly balanced by the violence of the reforming Dean Turner in the cathedral on the other, and he was, to the bishop's thinking, guilty of indiscreet behaviour in the pulpit: when reproved he made no amends, but ridiculed bishops, calling them "Whitecoats, Tippet-gentlemen, with other words of reproof much more unseemly."

At Hereford, Bishop Scory found his diocese disordered; and his cathedral, over which, to his great grief, he had no jurisdiction, he described as "a very nursery of blasphemy, whoredom, pride, superstition, and ignorance." The ecclesiastical commissioners intervened, and made the prebendaries read a protestation of loyalty to the English Church as "a true member of the Holy Catholic Church," and of assent to the supremacy and the prayer-book. Throughout the diocese the bishop took drastic measures to secure conformity; but where he succeeded it was in face of popish justices and largely by fear of the government, for not many of the worshipful of the shire were favourers of true religion. The city, however, defeated his

Hereford.

best efforts, kept a strict fast on the vigil of the Assumption, observed the day itself, though an abrogated festival, as a holiday, and persisted in the like course on other similar occasions. Recusants who had been expelled from Exeter, Worcester, and other places were received by the justices of the country, entertained, feasted, and honoured with a torch-light procession. Meanwhile the disconsolate bishop found himself in his own country "a mere stranger, abhorred of the most part for religion, living among them not without danger." No wonder that after this experience he attempted to recover visitational power over his rebellious cathedral.

In the diocese of Winchester opposition was less open. Bishop Horne at his visitation found the clergy ready to sign the *Declaration*, but the absentees were many, and ^{Winchester, June 1561.} many benefices were found to be too poor to support a minister. Two months later, when he took action by virtue of a diocesan ecclesiastical commission, a worse state of things was revealed to him and his fellow commissioners—"such is the fear of punishment by the purse more than of God's curse." The laity, who were specially dealt with, evaded the inquisition by moving from one place to another, the important men being especially difficult, and one openly abusive. Six months later the position was still unsatisfactory—"the prayer-book not hitherto frequented since the massing time," the churches vacant, and the people corrupted by the cathedral clergy.

The cathedral was visited later on, and a set of injunctions, dated May 18, 1562, show the requirements that were being made in cathedral churches. For the encouragement of learning there is to be a divinity lecture, which all must attend, a library is to be erected and maintained, the minor canons are to learn weekly a chapter of St. Paul's Epistles in Latin, and even the clerks and almsmen are to have New Testaments and read them. Sermons are to be preached every Sunday, for which the prebendaries are to be responsible, the chantry clerks and choir are to attend, and a metrical psalm is to be sung both before and after the sermon in the body of the church. There is to be communion every Sunday; prebendaries are to receive weekly, and clerks and almsmen monthly. Two principal topics are prescribed

for sermons, viz. the usurpation of the papacy and the enormities of the private mass. These requirements probably give an outline of the method of reform which was being attempted throughout the country. It was a serious effort after learning and efficiency.

Meanwhile Horne's attention had been summoned elsewhere, for important business awaited him as visitor of Winchester college and of several important colleges at Oxford. There are no such signs of trouble in the former as confronted Parker when he went to visit the sister foundation of Eton: there a provost had been turbulently elected, and it was found necessary to force him to resign, and to expel so many other recalcitrant members of the college that only three were left in possession; and only by degrees were the vacancies filled and a new set of statutes provided. At Winchester it was only necessary to urge attendance at sermons and lectures in the cathedral, communion weekly, or at least monthly, and the diligent inculcation of the catechism.

At Oxford the work was heavier: the university had been a stronghold of Marian teaching, "a den of thieves and of those who hate the light." To a great extent it remained so, for the royal visitation in 1559 had done little more than restore those who were unjustly deprived under Mary and begin a series of ejections for recusancy. This policy Horne had to carry on, and in September 1561 he was visiting New College, Magdalen, Trinity, and Corpus, and demanding subscription to the old formula of the royal visitation. Beyond this point he did not dare press; for, as it was, the prevailing confusion had emptied the university of students, and among those who were there, except at Magdalen, which he found thoroughly conformable in these matters, he experienced nothing but opposition. Frankly he reported to Cecil, "If I had peremptorily proceeded I should not scarcely have left twain in one house." Eight fellows of New College had already joined the swelling ranks of those who fled abroad, two chaplains were absent. All those present subscribed the old formula, except six; but when it came to dogmatic articles, four-and-twenty refused. The young scholars were no better

Eton and
Winchester
colleges.

Oxford
colleges
and their
dealings with
Horne

than the fellows, and refused to attend any service but the mass. Soon it was thought best to prorogue the visitation. It was resumed in the following March, 1562, but only to be again prorogued till Michaelmas. Meanwhile a very interesting question arose at Corpus, which shows the feeling to have been not all Marian. The President and others complained of certain fellows that they had violated the statutes by not being ordained to the priesthood. Their defence was to draw a distinction between the old priesthood and the new ministry, and so excuse themselves. Horne, in deciding the appeal, denied that there was any such distinction at all, and ordered them to be ordained to the priesthood within a year, or else to forfeit their fellowships; and for confirmation of his judgment he referred to a similar order given by his Edwardine predecessor Ponet, who had had the same doubt propounded to him, and had replied in the same sense. This was a double-edged thrust, for both Marian and Genevan were beginning to love the fictitious distinction. When Michaelmas came, a good number of the fellows of New College had changed their minds and subscribed; of the rest, some were expelled, others who were less obdurate were deferred and warned.

In the previous summer the archbishop had been visiting at All Souls and at Merton, and had found great disorders at the latter college. A small body of fellows, led by ^{and Parker.} Hall, the sub-warden, made themselves very active against the changes; their leader hid the old service-books and other monuments of superstition under the floor of the chapel, and tumultuously interrupted the singing of the metrical psalms which had been ordered for feasts in hall instead of the old Latin hymns. Peace was not restored till Hall was ejected; but a great part of Oxford sat sullen under the new *régime*. At Cambridge the case was very different: the university there had been as famous for its adoption of the new views as Oxford had been for its adherence to the old: its days of trouble were not yet, and when disturbance came it was from the opposite quarter.

In the northern province matters were delayed, because four sees there were not filled till 1561. Meanwhile everything remained as it had been left by the royal visitation,

which had only incompletely accomplished its task, leaving altars intact in many places, and clergy unsworn.

There are some signs of civil action in the matter in 1560, but the religious question was not really raised again till the vacancies were filled, when a commission was issued for the administration of the oath to the clergy, and the bishops combined this duty with their visitations. The main centre of government was the "Council of the North," which wielded large powers; the thinly-populated country was much under the influence of great peers, such as Lord Dacre and the Earl of Cumberland, who were the maintainers of the Marian religion; but, apart from such influence, Best, the bishop of Carlisle, found the people conformable. The clergy almost to a man were ready to subscribe, but the bishop was under no illusion as to the worth of such subscription. He described them "as wicked imps of Antichrist, and for the most part very ignorant and stubborn, past measure false, and soothly only fear maketh them obedient"; in some places the Latin mass was being said openly. The bishop had, however, underestimated the opposition. Soon the oath-taking was extended to lay officials and justices, and the tide of resistance rose higher. Public sympathy was on the side of those who refused the oath, and they were held in honour; the great peers hindered the Gospel, and the justices "looked through their fingers" at disorders. Rumours, tales, and controversial leaflets in French encouraged those who desired it to expect a speedy change back again, wherein Spaniard and French were to have a hand. Already the first mutterings are observable of the northern rebellion of 1569. In the extremer north and in his own county palatine Bishop Pilkington of Durham was encountering much of the same difficulty. His proceedings he likened to a fight with beasts, more savage than those which St. Paul encountered at Ephesus; and here too the worst features were that all popular sympathy was with the Recusants, and that conformity was only brought about through fear.

So far nearly the whole of the difficulties in religious government have appeared to come from one side: the recusancy and opposition of Marians were quicker to show

Later dealings in the north.

themselves than the corresponding qualities in Genevans; or perhaps it should be said with greater truth, that the bishops were inclined at first to look with much leniency on declension from the standard in that direction. It was not from the episcopate so much as from the government that objections were at the moment to be expected with regard to puritan practices. Just as it was the royal injunctions that rebuked the excesses of the first burst of iconoclasm, so it was in royal documents that similar rebukes are now to be found. At the beginning of the visitation a proclamation had been issued against defacers of monuments on September 19, 1560, which exempted not only sepulchral monuments, but also stained-glass windows, lead, and bells from the general wreck which was devastating most churches, and prescribed severe punishment for offenders. In the following January the queen, writing to the ecclesiastical commission to authorise the new calendar for the prayer-book, took the opportunity of also calling attention to the disgraceful state of many churches, the "open decays and ruins of coverings, walls and windows," the "unseemly tables with foul cloths for the communion of the sacraments," and the neglect which had left the churches "desolate of all cleanliness and of meet ornaments." The remedies propounded were not to modern thinking very thorough-going. The only ornament suggested to beautify the prevailing desolation was the table of commandments; but it is interesting to note the first appearance of a distinction between the requirements of parish churches and the requirements of collegiate and cathedral churches, which afterwards was again drawn in the more notorious case of the ornaments demanded by the "Advertisements."

Later orders of the same year were the result of a similar outburst of displeasure on the part of the queen at the proceedings of the Genevans and their followers. On August 9 a veritable bombshell was hurled into the camp of the clergy of that tendency, in the shape of an order excluding women and children from residence in the enclosures of colleges and cathedrals. The queen's wrath had been roused during her progress through the eastern counties by "the indiscreet behaviour of

The
lawlessness
of reform-
ing zeal.

The queen's
attack on
the married
clergy.

the readers and ministers" of those parts which were under the government of Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich: there was great variety in ministrations, great rebellion against the surplices; and even schismatics and anabaptists, whom the queen had banished by proclamation only a year previously, were winked at by this remiss prelate. The queen's dormant repulsion to clerical matrimony was greatly aroused, and it was only the stubbornness of Secretary Cecil that prevented an open condemnation or prohibition of the marriage of the clergy. Great consternation was caused by the edict: Bishop Cox of Ely, as an old scholar, did not disapprove the order so far as colleges were concerned; but he thought it disastrous with regard to cathedrals, and likely to defeat all efforts to secure residence from the cathedral clergy, besides being in itself a wrongful slight upon the married clergy. The archbishop went further, and expostulated with the queen; but he was only horrified by her reply, for she not only spoke regretfully of having appointed married clergy to office, but even threatened further injunctions on the subject. His gentle and domestic soul was cruelly wounded both by the order itself, and by the fact that it was issued "with conference of no ecclesiastical person"; he took it home to himself as a personal insult, and protested with some truth, that it was a sorry recompense to him for having, through faithful execution of the queen's orders, "purchased the hatred of the adversary, and procured to have the foul reports of some protestants by moderating some things indifferent." The phrase is a valuable definition of Parker's policy, and a fair statement of the result of it. Indeed, not only the archbishop but the central body of churchmen in general was rapidly coming to occupy the position which succeeding years have made more definite, midway between the hatred of the recusant adversary and the foul report of the protestant fanatic.

The series of royal orders for more reverence, decency, and order included two other items before the year 1561 closed. On October 10 the queen took further order, by letters addressed to the ecclesiastical commissioners, for the altering of the old rood lofts, from which the roods and other images had been dethroned, into partitions or screens, and for the erection of

Other royal
orders.

such partitions between the chancel and church where none existed. Provision was also made for the repair, if necessary, of the pavement, steps, font, etc.; where damage had been done by over-zealous hands, and for the preservation of what remained; for the decent covering of the communion table with a fair linen cloth and a cloth of silk, buckram, or other such stuff, and for the erection of the tables of commandments. Further innovation and alienation of the fabric was forbidden, and some disciplinary orders were added concerning baptisms and sponsors, registers, marriages, the purchase of books of sermons by the parish at the command of the ordinary, and the observance of none but the authorised fasts and festivals. This order had much effect, and can constantly be traced in later documents and practice. At the end of the month the other order was issued in the form of "A Proclamation made for the reverent usage of all churches and churchyards." The chief cause of this was the behaviour in St. Paul's cathedral, where fighting, bargaining, business appointments, and similar disturbances were the common accompaniments even of sermons and lectures; but the proclamation went probably not very wide of the mark when it implied that similar abuses occurred elsewhere. These were no new disorders, though the quarrels had multiplied or acquired a new zest from the religious differences; nor were they easily dealt with in this way, for St. Paul's at least preserved its old reputation till a much later epoch.

It has been necessary to multiply descriptions and to collect evidence from various sources, in order to give as fair a view as may be of the real state of the country at this critical moment of its religious history. The result is complex: as the tumult which arose and swept the churches bare in 1559 subsided, the latent but strenuous opposition of the conservative element emerged. The bishops and the commissioners found their hands full in proceeding against recusants and their fautors, against priests who still secretly said their mass, and against layfolk who still secretly attended it. The Council attempted to deal with the situation in its own fashion, and especially to make an example of conspicuous men, such as Sir Thomas Wharton and Sir Edward Waldegrave, who were mixed up with secret

Summary of
the situation

masses ; and even of Sir Thomas Stradling, who had done no worse than distribute four pictures of a cross found depicted in the trunk of a tree, which was blown down in his park in far-off Glamorganshire. Meanwhile the party soon to be called "puritan" had for a short time a freedom of which it took full advantage, till the government in alarm began its repressive edicts. Scylla and Charybdis were daily becoming more clearly defined, and the excitement grew more intense as the vessel continued its course between them—the central party of the Church between its two extremes. But when the eye of the student of the period has looked forward and grasped that division of parties which was ultimately to emerge, the next thing for him to do is to look back and see how inchoate and ill-defined the whole of the actual position of things still was ;—the left comprised many gradations of reforming zeal still barely distinguishable from one another ; the right was hardly less complex ; and the centre was only gradually forming itself round the middle policy, which at first seemed to be only the dubious project of a temporising government, but which subsequent history has commended to English churchmen as the course shaped by the sure providence of God.

The English bishops then living might be taken as fairly representative of the greater part of these differences. On the one hand, Goldwell, who fled abroad, may stand for the new exiles of Louvain and Douai ; Bonner ^{and of the} types of men. for the uncompromising, David Pole for the gentle, recusant ; Kitchin for the Marian of unhonourable conformity ; Parker for the catholic-minded reformer ; Jewel for the protestantism which is too learned to be merely protestant ; Grindal for the reluctant conformist ; Pilkington for the abusive, and Parkhurst for the thorough-going reformer. All parties were represented in the episcopate, except the extreme men of the left, such as Sampson or Turner, whose views, whatever complexion they might for the moment seem to have, were really chiefly coloured by a dislike of episcopacy.

AUTHORITIES.—The *Zurich Letters* and *Parker Correspondence* are the chief authorities for the history of the queen's crucifix, and of the vestiarian controversy at this stage. For the Marian bishops see Bridgett and Knox, *u.s.*, and Dr. Gee, *Eliz. Clergy*. Horne's report of the diocese of Durham and many similar are in *S.P. Dom.* For Cecil's embassy to Scotland see Haynes, *Burghley Papers*. The documents of the visitation are in Strype and in *Docu-*

mentary Annals, but Parkhurst's injunctions must be sought in the *Ritual Commission Report*. For St. Asaph see Wilkins, *Concilia*; for Bath and Wells and other dioceses see *S.P. Dom.* xvi.-xxi.; Lansd. MS. viii.; cp. Tierney's Dodd, *Church History*. Bishop Horne's visitations are recorded in his Register, and his reports of them are in *S. P. Dom.* xix. 56. For a legal decision as to the identity of the old priesthood and the new ministry in April 1561 see Dyer, *Reports*, 203, 231^v. The royal proclamations and orders are in *Docum. Annals*, and *Parker Corr.*; the order as to rood lofts is in Perry, *Lawful Church Ornaments*, and Dr. Gee, *Elis. Prayer-Book*.

CHAPTER V

EXTERNAL POLICY AND CONTROVERSY

THE accession of Elizabeth turned the eyes of all Europe to England; some of the interest was principally diplomatic or merely matrimonial, but some had a very direct bearing on ecclesiastical affairs. It has already been shown how Spanish influence kept the papacy friendly in the early days, though the tempestuous Paul IV. was on the papal throne. Even after the proceedings of 1559 the same favour continued; and in the following year, after the accession of the gentle Pius IV., a definite mission was sent to convey, in the form of an official letter, some paternal exhortations from the pope to his "dearest daughter," urging her to return to the bosom of the Church.

Foreign
relations.

The bearer was Parpaglia, abbot of the convent of San Salvatore at Turin, and of old a henchman of Cardinal Pole. The way was carefully smoothed for him and his errand. When the news came of his mission the queen professed herself delighted. She told the Spanish ambassador that she was as catholic as any in the kingdom, though she was temporising for the moment, and promised the abbot a hearty welcome. His mission was regarded as a triumph for the Marian interests as represented in Rome by Sir Francis Englefield and Mary's old envoy to the Vatican, Sir Edward Carne. A month later the queen's mind was changed; she unsaid to the Spanish ambassador all that she had said before, and joined in his dislike of the abbot as a person too French in his sympathies. The nuncio was kept waiting in the Low Countries week after week, for a safe-

The mission
of Parpaglia,
May 1560.

conduct to enable him to enter England, which never came; and was detained at the same time by the machinations of Philip, who feared some hostile act against Elizabeth. The papal letter probably never reached its destination, though a copy was sent to the English government by its ambassador in Spain. In October the abbot was recalled, and the queen's diplomacy triumphed: she had secured a new tenure of Philip's favour, and at the same time evaded the disturbance which would have followed in ill-disposed circles in England if Parpaglia had ever pursued his journey there.

Soon came another papal envoy in his track, Martinengo by name; and, like Parpaglia, he was stayed in Flanders, awaiting a safe-conduct; but the invitation which he conveyed from the pope was delivered, and caused much talk and diplomacy; it was an invitation to Elizabeth to send representatives to the council which was soon to be reopened at Trent.

and
Martinengo,
February
1561.

The council which was to heal the divisions of Christendom had long been demanded. The present assembly had originally been convoked in 1536; but it had not begun its career till 1545, when a small number of bishops and delegates assembled at Trent, representing a mere fraction of western Christendom, and that only half-heartedly. The pope, Paul III., from the first took pains to make clear that it was no more free than it was representative. After seven sessions the prelates fled before an imaginary epidemic, and because the pope attempted to transfer the council to Italy in March 1547; but the opposition of the emperor negated all these projects and proceedings, and the council was renewed at Trent in 1551 by Julius III. A few months of troublous discussion revealed the helplessness of the assembly, and again it scattered, this time in face of a victorious army. In spite of this inglorious history, Pius IV., after his election to succeed Paul IV. on December 26, 1559, showed himself anxious to renew the council at Trent, and was forced thereto by threatenings of Gallicanism in France. Before the end of 1560 the bull was issued summoning the prelates and princes of Christendom to meet there at the ensuing Easter. The invitations were sent, not to the limited circle which had hitherto been represented, but to all Christendom—Russians,

The Council
of Trent.

Copts, and Armenians, as well as Lutherans ; and thus came Martinengo, with a larger task than Parpaglia, and hoping to succeed where he had failed.

Elizabeth repeated her old tactics, and blew both hot and cold. At first she welcomed the council, and said she would conform to its decisions ; then more coldly she said that she was willing enough to send envoys to the council if she could be satisfied that it would be a free council ; but she was distressed that the pope, by not consulting her, had classed her among protestant sovereigns. She must have an assurance that her bishops, whom she should send, would take their places like any other catholic bishops. She coquetted with France on the subject and played with Spain ; she sent Cecil to Quadra, the Spanish ambassador, to propose conferences about reunion and to lay down the conditions on which she would send envoys. The attempt was even made to bring Parker into discussion with Quadra. Much negotiation went on in March and April, and meanwhile the lot of the Marians was alleviated. At the end of April the Court was said to be moving to Greenwich, in order that the queen might there meet the nuncio and carry on the negotiations, with the object of sparing him the danger that beset him if he were quartered in London ; but on the first of May the Council at Greenwich decided against admitting the nuncio.

Four days later an official reply was handed to the Spanish ambassador, who had been urging Martinengo's admission. This document explained that such a course would be contrary to the law and custom of the realm, as even Queen Mary's treatment of a papal nuncio had shown ; and that, further, it would be likely to cause internal dissension and disloyalty. With regard to Trent, it was decided that though a general council to restore unity would be truly welcome, and though the queen would be most willing to take her part in such a project, the pope's assembly seemed likely to tend rather to discord than concord, to judge by the method used in summoning it, and the precedents it was to follow in its procedure, being simply a continuation of the previous council, summoned without any previous consultation with the English throne.

Elizabeth's
attitude
towards it.

Martinengo
is refused
admission.

The change of attitude was sudden, and disconcerting to the English recusants and Quadra their ally. It is also difficult to explain. Was the thing all along a well-sustained farce? or was the queen ever really hoping to take the nuncio or the council seriously? Was there a real reaction? or was the government waiting upon the feeling of the country, and glad to fall in with it when it showed itself to be predominantly protestant? It is more likely that the decision was a matter of policy than that it was a matter either of principle or of caprice. The negotiations seem to have been diplomatic and not ecclesiastical. Quadra thought that he discerned the hands of the episcopate in it; but there is more probability in his other suggestion, that the result was due to news from the protestant princes abroad. Among them the council had met with but little consideration, for the Lutherans felt now, as formerly, that there was no fair hearing or fair decision to be expected from it; and Elizabeth, who had already found that at home the bare proximity of papal nuncios meant disorder and the encouragement of disloyalty, might well be glad to throw in her lot with the protestant party abroad, and return to her repressive measures at home.

The action of the pope seems friendly and generous; but it must be remembered that at the same moment another of his nuncios had made his way into Ireland and was stirring up rebellion there. He had sent Martinengo, because it was officially stated that the queen was favourable to the council; and having done so, he refused, pending the result of the mission, to go any further to encourage the rebels in Ireland. The queen's refusal freed his hands; and thus in two respects it marked a very definite stage—first, of the growing separation of the English Church from catholics abroad, and second, of the growing hostility of the papacy to the English crown.

In connexion with the mission of these envoys from Rome there began the rumours that the pope was willing to confirm the prayer-book as catholic, if the queen would acknowledge the same as received from him. No direct documentary evidence of such a proposal is forthcoming: in delicate matters of diplomacy the crucial

The reasons
for the
decision.

The papal
action,

and its bearing
on the
prayer-book.

points are not written. But it is clear that Parpaglia had authority to go beyond his written instructions. It is clear also that before the monotony of his disappointed sojourn in Flanders, he had been to France in June 1560 in order to consult with some there. Two months at least earlier the Latin edition of the prayer-book had been issued, which was calculated to give foreign catholics an all too favourable view of the English service: it attracted much attention, and especially it was regarded favourably in the French court. At the end of 1561, in view of the proposals as to reformed services which were expected to be brought up at the coming council, the English rite was there thought likely to have more suffrages than any other. Such was the state of things, as contemporary documents show; and all this is entirely consistent with the report that about this time the Cardinal of Lorraine made to the English ambassador such a papal offer with regard to the prayer-book, although the evidence for the report is not to be found till ten years later. The pope's alleged offer was continually spoken of from 1571 onwards; the queen herself talked openly of it. The Recusants of later days were eager to deny it; but this was certainly not the frame of mind of the Recusants of 1562. There were many of them who were anxious above all things to get at any rate so much approval of the English book as would enable them conscientiously to make such attendances at its services as the law required. For many people this was the burning question of the moment. The prayer-book had never been condemned by papal authority. Many who disliked it were quite ready to attend their parish churches still: others were more scrupulous and hesitated to do so without some authorisation; and the number who altogether refused the English service as inconsistent with their conscientious scruples was still microscopically small.

The few were, however, the active. Early in 1562 a little document in French, which Bishop Best discovered to be secretly circulating in his diocese, contained a prohibition of attendance at English services. Many hoped that if attendance at the eucharist was impossible, yet mere formal appearance at the reading of psalms and lessons might be possible; and even at sermons, though

The Recusants
and church
attendance.

they might contain attacks on their own doctrinal position. The poor Recusants were already beginning to be torn in two. The stricter school went zealously about the country taking the uncompromising line. Their chief leader was William Allen, late Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, who was early in the reign one of a numerous band who betook themselves abroad. Ill-health brought him back from Louvain to his native country in 1562, and his zeal and ability soon made him prominent. On the other hand, exhortations of the contrary sort were made with pathos and earnestness to many who were in prison, or in danger of prison, for their refusal.

A demand for some settlement was drawn up, called *Catholicorum postulatio*, and sent to the Council of Trent, while a similar case was sent to the pope. It was a pathetic petition for a conciliatory reply; and the covering letter, in which the Spanish ambassador forwarded it to Rome, went so far as to explain that the services in question, consisting only of Scripture and prayers taken from the catholic Church, contained no impiety or false doctrine, though what concerned the merit and intercession of saints had been omitted. The answer in both cases dashed the petitioners' hopes, and pronounced attendance at the English services to be unlawful. Allen therefore went about enforcing this decision and encouraging recusancy, till in 1565 England became too hot for him. Still there were many who maintained that obedience to the pope and attendance at the English service were not incompatible, and many further steps were yet to be taken in order to detach such persons from the English Church and its services. A similar petition for some means of absolution on behalf of those who felt themselves to have incurred ecclesiastical censures by conformity was more favourably answered. The pope sent a brief giving such authority to Quadra the Spanish ambassador, with power to delegate it to others. Thus the sombre alliance between recusancy and Spanish diplomacy, already well established, was now officially sealed.

The pope who sat at Geneva heard appeals from England on the subject of the English services as well as the pope who sat at Rome; and an interesting letter from him, dated August 12, 1561, solved the doubts which some of his

followers had propounded to him, and approved the English practices. The two points of chief interest concern communion. Calvin was in favour of aiming at ^{The appeal to Geneva.} monthly rather than quarterly communion, but was willing for the time to be content with rare communions since the people were reluctant. He also expressed himself in favour of communicating the sick; and, though he felt the dangers that beset the carrying of the holy sacrament to them, as custom still apparently sanctioned under the Elizabethan prayer-book, he was willing to approve of it under certain restrictions. There must be some gathering of people to communicate, and some words explanatory of what was being done, on the same lines as the ordinary Church service; care must also be taken to ensure that the sacrament was not brought from church with any ceremony or false notion of sanctity, and that the privilege was really needed and would not be abused.

Reinforced by this authority, the carrying of the sacrament to the sick was continued a while. This was not called "reservation" in the controversial language of the day, but it was allowed by English divines while ^{Carrying the sacrament to the sick.} they attacked the Roman Church for its custom of reservation. Their line of attack was threefold, and as it has been much misunderstood, it is important to define it clearly. First, they repudiated the giving of communion to the sick man alone, as savouring of the private mass; secondly, they objected to continuous reservation without reference to sick communions; and thirdly, they denied that the English Church had done anything outrageous in abolishing the old customs of reservation, seeing they were not parts of Christ's ordinance. Calvin's line of argument was adopted in defence of the English custom both as against Roman methods and as against those that denied communion altogether to the sick at home. Parker, in preparing for authorisation the abortive Edwardine code of ecclesiastical law called the *Reformatio Legum*, made a small but significant alteration in order to sanction under a restriction like that of the Book of 1549 the carrying of the sacrament to the sick. In later days a rival custom arose of consecrating in private houses for the sick; perhaps it even existed simultaneously, but no explicit provision was made for this till 1661.

While the Recusant did his best to think that the Latin and the English services were not incompatible, the government was under no such illusion. In the early part of the reign its energies were more devoted to suppressing illicit Latin masses than to enforcing conformity. As the distinction between recusants and conformists became more defined and wider, the efforts of the authorities became more energetic. With the establishment of the second ecclesiastical commission on July 30, 1562, to take the place of the original commission which had been at work exactly three years, a new era of strictness was opened. A close watch was kept on recusant clergy, and they were as far as possible restricted to certain places or districts where they could be kept under supervision. The first diocesan list of recusants was demanded and made; fresh prisoners were added to the few already in custody. As early as Candlemas 1560 a raid had been made upon the chapels at the French and Spanish embassies, and a number of English subjects who were at mass at the former were arrested. Then there was an interval of quiet; but as the Spanish embassy became more and more a centre of recusancy and disaffection, drastic measures were again taken at the beginning of 1563; the house was put under lock and key, and at the service on Candlemas Day fresh arrests were made. Hitherto the dealings had been exceedingly lenient; imprisonments were few, even the fines for non-attendance at church do not seem to have been levied, while the culprits at the Spanish embassy were only bound over in recognisances. But latterly a tide of indignation and popular feeling had been rising; it was due partly to the influence of the course of events in France, where the massacre of Vassy on March 1, 1562, had embittered the religious strife, and partly to the increased definiteness and hostility of recusancy in England; and the year was to see considerable changes.

In turning to consider the literature of the controversy the reader must be prepared for much that is sordid and irrelevant in character, and when all allowance has been made for the difference of that age from the present, much on either side will seem unwarrantably personal, bitter, and violent. The principal springs of controversy in

The govern-
ment's repres-
sion of
recusancy.

The
controversial
literature.

these early days of Elizabeth are five ; in each case the rivals were Rome and Canterbury, for the controversy with Geneva was of later date. The streams that flowed from these springs soon broadened, and in certain cases intermingled, becoming, as might be expected, more voluminous and less profitable in the process. No attempt will be made here to describe their lower reaches in any detail, but only to give an account of their origin and a brief outline of their earlier course.

The first spontaneous attack upon the action of the English Church came from a Portuguese bishop, Jerome Osorio, whose only qualification for the task seems to have been the possession of a fine Latin style. On the strength of a report that Elizabeth had been pleased with his book *De Vera Nobilitate*, he ventured to admonish her on the condition and needs of her kingdom. His ignorance of the real state of the case would be astonishing to the English reader, were it not that he is accustomed still to find the Osorian tradition prevalent abroad. For the Portuguese scholar, Luther is the author of all the revolt, and his teaching inevitably ends in determinism, atheism, and anarchy. Great torrents of episcopal eloquence were poured forth, but all was intangible, imaginary, and frothy,—a mere exercitation polished in the visionary seclusion of "Arcoburge in Portugale." Alas for the bishop's reputation ! His effusion acquired a prominence that it did not deserve. When it had been delivered to the queen, it was handed about in manuscript, became the rage in Paris, was smuggled into print both in French and Latin, and was bought up with enthusiasm.

The quality of the attack was rightly gauged at the English Court, and the task of replying was entrusted, not to a theologian, but to the classical scholar Dr. Walter Haddon, that the Cicero of England might outshine the Lusitanian Cicero, and a victory of Latinity be the result. Haddon reproved the bishop's presumption and exposed his ignorance, scornfully suggesting that in writing so much about "tumults" he had mistaken England for France. In so treating the letter Haddon made the only reply worth making ; but he informed the adversary for his comfort that sacraments were not abolished, that the royal supremacy was not *in sacris*, and that the freedom of the will had not been repudiated.

i. Osorio's
attack,
March 1563.

Haddon's
reply.

Both the attack and the reply were translated into English. Richard Shacklock, a fugitive from Cambridge to Louvain, issued the former in 1565 under the title of *A Further course of this controversy. Precious Pearl for a Prince*, to persuade the queen to "come out of the cockring bote of schismatical noysomenes into the stedfast arcke of Noy." The reply was translated by Hartwell with the title *A Sight of the Portugal Pearl*. But the controversy did not end here. Emmanuel Dalmada, bishop of Angra, being in Flanders with the regent, Margaret of Parma, took up the cudgels on behalf of his brother bishop, and covered two hundred and fifty pages without advancing the cause. In the following year, 1567, Osorio's own reply appeared: he had taken some steps to gain a little information, but not enough to disturb his old position; and the chief part of his hundred and fifty pages were spent in charges as vague and rhetoric as vapid as before. After an English translation had been published in 1568 as *A learned and very eloquent Treatie*, an interval followed, and the controversy might well have died a natural death; but Haddon left an unfinished reply when he died in 1572, and Foxe, the martyrologist, finished it in 1577. He was probably the only English writer whose Latinity was worthy to stand beside Haddon's. Thus the contest remained to the last more notable as a rivalry of classical scholarship than as a controversy of divinity.

In other disputations it was bishops and divines, and not laymen like Haddon, that were protagonists. A fresh controversy arose in most dramatic fashion out of a fire which destroyed a considerable part of St. Paul's cathedral, and formed an omen for divers men to interpret in divers ways. Pilkington, the newly consecrated bishop of Durham, gave his interpretation when preaching at Paul's Cross four days after. His sermon, which was published in brief as an appendix to a tract describing the fire, caused much stir, since he took the calamity to be a warning of worse evils to follow, unless abuses were speedily reformed. Bonner's late chaplain, John Morwen, took a different view, and disseminated it in pamphlet form through the streets of Chester, which was the centre of his sphere of "seditious" activity. His *Addition*

ii. The controversy arising out of the fire at St. Paul's on June 4, 1563.

with an apologie to the causes . . . uttered at Paules Crosse maintained that the fire was a judgment, because "the people of this realm be declined from the steps of St. Augustine and other blessed fathers and saints"; and he proceeded to specify certain points of the alleged declension.

In 1563 the bishop published a *Confutation*, long and violent, but of a considerable common-sense ability. He printed the *Addition* in full, and selected fourteen points for his reply. With regard to the central point—the declension from the old faith, with mass and seven sacraments—he pointed out that six of the so-called sacraments were retained; only unction had been given up, and others were differently called and used: e.g. "confession is left free to all that feel themselves burdened in conscience," and not imposed. There followed an interesting comparison between the old and the new services and customs as used in St. Paul's. When Morwen complained of widespread disobedience to the Church, Pilkington made the very central and incisive complaint that "under the name of the Church he ever understands Rome; yea, and not when it continued in any pure religion, but even in these latter days, when it is overwhelmed with infinite superstitions." Therein he touched the heart of the whole dispute; and, though his reply touched many topics, and gives a vivid picture of English life such as is not to be found in other controversial works, no further advance was made. Morwen had ended his tract with thirteen brief questions and their answers, and Pilkington ended his *Confutation* with pithy comments upon them. If all controversy could have been conducted by such summary methods, there would have been more time available for more profitable occupations.

Pilkington's
reply to
Morwen.

The cross in the royal chapel was made the starting-point of a small and comparatively self-restrained controversy in 1564. John Martial, one of the exile band at Louvain, put forth *A Treatise of the Crosse*, and had the courage to dedicate it to Elizabeth. He discussed methodically and temperately ten propositions with regard to the meaning and use of the cross, and attacked the prayer-book because of the omissions in the ceremony of baptism, the deferring or discrediting of confirmation, and the

iii. Martial's
treatise on
the cross,

absence of the sign of the cross and of any manual acts from the consecration prayer. In his concluding pages he launched out into more general topics, and made complaints which were exaggerated and even ludicrous, such as these, that there was no consecration, no confession, no fasting. He even complained that "these new men forbid the people to pray in church," and his only justification for this wild statement was the Elizabethan injunction which ordered the congregation to attend and follow the course of the service as it went on, instead of spending the time in saying private prayers.

A bitter reply was framed in 1565 by James Calfhill, who already had a reputation as a blatant preacher. From the title-page, where he spoke of the treatise as "dreams and dotages," to the last page, where he refused to deal with Martial's "conclusion" on the ground that it was but "a heap of lies," all was venomous, and deserved far more blame for exaggeration than the treatise to which it replied. However, unlike the previous encounters of Osorio or Pilkington, this was all learned; there was much haggling over patristic passages, much debate about the iconoclastic controversy, much discussion of legends and narratives of doubtful authenticity and dubiously edifying. Here the controversy ended, except that in later days William Fulke, the puritan divine of Cambridge, returned to the attack on Martial: but Fulke was the professional controversialist who could not keep his fingers out of anybody's quarrel; so his interference was as inevitable as it was unimportant.

The next controversy was of a more personal kind, and is interesting more from the facts and circumstances that it reveals than from the arguments of which it was composed. John Howman, better known as Feckenham, from the place of his birth, the late Abbot of Westminster, was one of the most distinguished of the Marian leaders and one of the most estimable. His speech at the discussion of the Uniformity Bill has been already described, and before that occasion he had made himself conspicuous among the audience at the Westminster disputation by joining with the Archbishop of York in the attempt to bring the disputants of his own party

iv. The history of Feckenham's pamphlet,

to behave reasonably. Since then his lot had run parallel to the lot of the Marian bishops, and at the beginning of 1563, when the parliament began the severer measures hereafter to be described, he, like them, was in prison. He there wrote a paper justifying a refusal of the new oath of supremacy. Later on, when he was liberated from the Tower and entrusted to the custody of Horne, Bishop of Winchester, controversy arose, first verbal and then documentary. The abbot gave the bishop his treatise to read; but this only led to more open disagreement. The quarrel became personal, and soon the bishop's table at Waltham became the scene of recriminations. Next the abbot was banished into solitude; but he was allowed the use of the gallery and the leads from which there was a view over the park, and even allowed with an attendant to walk in the park thrice a week. Then the bishop, thinking this to be over-generous, prevailed upon the Council to order the abbot back to the Tower. From his prison he managed to spread about a book, probably only in manuscript, entitled *The resolution of such scruples of conscience touching the oath of supremacy as Mr. John Feckenham by writing did deliver unto the Lord Bishop of Winchester, with his resolutions made thereunto.*

When the bishop procured a copy, he issued and printed *An Answer*, in which he dealt with the controversial points at issue as to the oath. He also complained of the title and of the whole account given of his dealings ^{and Bishop Horne's reply,} with the abbot as misleading, and gave another ^{1566.} version of the story. The abbot was hardly in the position to reply. When he originally put out his second defence, *i.e.* that of which the bishop complained, he sent a copy of it to Cecil with a letter dated March 14, 1564/5, asking for better justice at his hands, or at least for the recognition that his refusal of the oath was a conscientious refusal. Nothing came of this; a fresh period of imprisonment lay before him. When he was at last let out in 1577 and entrusted to the custody of Bishop Cox of Ely, his experiences were not much less troublous than they had been before, and possibly it was a relief to the much-harassed old man to find himself back again in prison at the castle at Wisbeach in 1580. There he died in 1585, one of the most interesting figures

of the time. His cause was taken up in 1567 by Thomas Stapleton, an Oxford Louvanian and a bulky controversialist, who expended over a thousand quarto pages in a reply to Horne.

Last of all comes the immense group of disputes which cluster round the name and European reputation of John

Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury—a family group which
v. Jewel's
 challenge,
 Nov. 1559; needs a family pedigree to make clear its ramifications.

Jewel was not an unworthy progenitor: he had been public orator at Oxford, and had made friends there even with his theological opponents. The Marian reaction dealt hardly with him, till in terror he recanted his position; but he escaped to Frankfort, and there confessed his fault before the congregation. His exile brought him into close touch with foreign reformers, and he came back imbued with their spirit to take part in the Westminster disputation and in the drawing up of the confession of faith of the exiles. But his scholarship and wide knowledge of antiquity kept him from mere negative protestantism, and the care of a diocese brought home to him the practical value of the catholic system. As his frail and diminutive form stood up in the pulpit at Paul's Cross to deliver the famous challenge, which was the starting-point of this group of controversies, he figured as the chosen representative of the English reform, hostile to Rome, sympathetic to Geneva, but committed only to such assertions of catholic truth as could be justified by reference to the double standard of Scriptures and the doctrine of the primitive Church, as expressed by authoritative councils and the consent of the Fathers.

Thus the contest was a contest of methods quite as much as of results. It was only to be expected that the exact

application of the Anglican method could not take
its signifi-
 cance place all at once, and that, so far as results went, its

earlier conclusions must needs be somewhat provisional: further inquiry and exacter scholarship were sure hereafter to modify them in detail. But meanwhile Jewel pledged himself and others to obtain the best results that they could, and before all things to maintain the supremacy of their method as against the papal method. It was a fortunate circumstance that such a scholar as Jewel was available for the task.

The form of the controversy from the first was determined by these circumstances. Jewel began not by denunciation nor by denial, but by a challenge, asseverating that he could not tolerate certain doctrines and practices ^{and course.} of the Roman Church till they could be proved to stand the test of this double touchstone. His first throwing down of the gauntlet was before his consecration. On November 26, 1559, preaching at Paul's Cross a sermon which has not been preserved, he proclaimed that if any one could produce proofs from the Fathers, Councils, Scriptures, or example of the primitive Church, that during the first six centuries any one of fifteen points enumerated by him was approved, he would yield the case to him. The challenge was repeated in the following Lent, after Jewel was a bishop, once at Court and once again at Paul's Cross; at the same time, it was enlarged by the addition of twelve further points.

The second sermon produced a correspondence. Dr. Cole, late Dean of St. Paul's, wrote on the following day innocently as one desiring instruction: he ventured on one criticism, and a valuable one, viz. that Jewel's ^{Correspondence with Cole.} articles did not go to the heart of the controversy, but concerned points that admittedly might be altered by a general council. Why not, he pleaded, raise the question of the real presence, of the eucharistic sacrifice, the questions of grace and justification, the questions of invocation of saints or prayers for the dead? Jewel replied, and, as the correspondence went on, it became increasingly clear that the tactics of the Westminster disputation were being repeated. Cole now, as then, wanted to have the defensive side and the last word. After two letters had passed on each side in ten days there was a pause of ten days, and then it was found that copies of a third letter were circulating privately which had never been sent at all to Jewel (April 1560). Later on Cole acknowledged this to be an abridged edition of a letter of his own, but still he demurred to sending his handiwork to Jewel; whereupon the bishop published the whole correspondence, ending with the reply which he had written to the abridged letter, and for the moment the incident was closed. It was none too soon. Cole evinced no real readiness to dispute, and the letters were degenerating into personalities as to the past

retractions of the respective disputants, or into irrelevancies such as the rights and wrongs of the Westminster fiasco.

For the future all replies to the Elizabethan defendants came either from secret pamphlets or from beyond the seas.

Cooper
upholds
Jewel.

This was inevitable, for Cole had a just grievance when he complained that, though Jewel might challenge from Paul's Cross, no reply would be allowed by the government to be made openly. The leading Marian were already bound over not to dispute, and even Cole's diplomatic epistles apparently cost him an appearance before the mild inquisition sitting at Lambeth. His controversy was continued in an anonymous pamphlet called *An Apology of Private Mass*, which took up the challenge of the first of Jewel's articles, and replied to it, following Cole's line. A copy fell in 1562 into the hands of Thomas Cooper, an Oxford scholar, who, under a medical disguise, had remained in England and Oxford through the Marian times. When the change came he reverted to theology, and in November 1562 issued, also anonymously, his *Answer to the Apology of Private Mass*, perpetuating it in print while he replied to it.

Then began the booming of artillery from Louvain. First, Dr. Smith found a place in a series of tracts, published in

Replies from
abroad.

1562, for a refutation of Jewel's attacks on the mass; then in 1564 three further attacks followed of far more considerable calibre and with some extended results. In June began Jewel's principal opponent,

Harding's
attack.

Thomas Harding, late deacon, and fellow of New College, Oxford, and now an exile and reordained; he was an old friend of the bishop, and was singled out, perhaps on that account, for a personal reply, since in other respects he seems little superior to the rest of the foe. His *Answer* was voluminous, and dealt with each of the seven-and-twenty articles of Jewel's challenge. The bishop had asked for a single "sentence," and he certainly could not complain of a niggardly reply. Harding claimed to have secured a victory in all the fifteen original points of the challenge: the twelve additional ones were of less importance; some he found true though "over curious," some perverted for controversial purposes. To all this Jewel replied at length, noting two hundred and fifty-five "untruths" by marginal

notes, and dealing with Harding paragraph by paragraph in his *Reply unto M. Harding's Answer*. The dispute was becoming wearisome and degenerating into personalities and side issues; but Harding was persistent. In 1566 there was published his *Rejoinder to the Reply*, as well as a book called *A Return of Untruths upon M. Juell's Reply*; but even so Harding did not have the last word, as he was taken up in E. Dering's *Sparing Restraint of many Lavish Untruths* of 1568. Beyond that point there is no need to follow the main stem of the pedigree.

The two remaining collateral branches of this year need some notice. A month after Harding there followed Dorman, a convert and disciple of Harding, and like him brought up in the two great Colleges of Wykeham: he took up in his *Proof* four of Jewel's articles only, discussed the papacy at great length, and handled more briefly three points of sacramental doctrine. His last thirty pages are of some historical interest, for he advanced twelve points of his own against the position of the English Church, mocking at its change of doctrine, rites, and ceremonies, denying its sacraments, scorning its divisions; caricaturing much, but giving a picture of the situation which, with all its exaggerations, is welcome to eyes wearied with endless argumentations. A reply, under the title of *A Reproof of the Proof*, was begun by Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, who, after expending 124 pages on Dorman's first 15 pages, stopped to recuperate. Dorman, taking advantage of the pause, replied with *A Disproof of M. Nowell's Reproof* (1565). Nowell, undeterred, resumed his parable at the fifteenth page of the *Proof*, expended nearly 300 pages more, and reached the fiftieth page of Dorman's original book with a second part of the *Disproof*. Not half his task was done yet; but even Elizabethan controversialists and their printers and publishers were only human, and posterity may be grateful that the bout ended there.

Dorman's
attack and
Nowell's
defence.

In November 1564 appeared John Rastell's *Confutation of a Sermon pronounced by M. Juell*. Its most noteworthy feature was its conclusion, wherein Rastell exercised his ingenuity in devising rival "challenges." The articles in these were largely of a derisive character.

Rastell's
attack.

Can any learned man prove that bagpipers, horse-courers, jailers, or ale-tasters should be admitted to the clergy? That a friar of over sixty years should become a bishop and marry a woman of nineteen?—this was a false charge against the much-maligned Scory. That the residue of the sacrament should be taken away by a priest and buttered for his children? That the Lent fast is a matter of civil policy, not of devotion? Others are noteworthy because they reveal the customs of the time in church service—the movable communion table, the placing of the ring in marriage on the left hand instead of the right, the slovenly handing on of the chalice from one communicant to another, and so forth. Rastell had the spirit of a satirist rather than that of a grave theologian, and in succeeding books he carried on controversy upon lively lines.

We must revert to Jewel himself. From the first sounding of the trumpet-note of challenge complaints had been made, either that he did not go to the real central points of the controversy, or else that he ought to begin by justifying the reforms made in England rather than by calling on the holders of the traditional views to justify them. Friends as well as foes felt that "the religion" now used should be defended by the same method which was used to criticise the old religion. Well-wishers in France, catholic, but not over-well disposed to Rome and the state of affairs, urged that it was time to set forth an apology to approve the ceremonies and usages retained in the Church of England, and to disseminate it in Latin, that foreigners might be better informed of the true state of the case. Jewel was obviously the person best equipped for the task, and, after his controversy with Cole was ended, he seems to have set about it under the encouragement of Parker and Cecil. On January 1, 1562, Parker sent a copy of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* to Cecil, and steps were taken at once to circulate it abroad. The only regret was that it had not been ready by the time of the great conference between catholics and Calvinists held at Poissy in the autumn of 1561.

The book at once became a classic: it was translated into English by Lady Bacon, wife of the Lord Treasurer, and her translation was published in 1564 with a commendatory epistle from the archbishop; other translations followed,

into Greek and many other languages. From the literary point of view alone it may be considered a masterpiece of terseness and cogency: the whole defence is contained in some fifty pages of close argument, all designed to show that no charge of heresy can be proved against the English Church, because it has only made such changes as were necessary, within its competence, and consistent with a catholic position. The method of defence is to "shew it plain that God's holy gospel, the ancient bishops, and the primitive Church do make on our side, and that we have not without just cause left these men, or rather have returned to the apostles and old catholic fathers." In the second part the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies were briefly reviewed in turn; in the third part charges of sectarianism and antinomian heresies were rebutted; in the fourth part a passionate attack was made upon the abuses of the Church of Rome; the fifth brought many of its customs to the balances of antiquity and found them wanting; the last dealt with the questions of supremacy, with crown, pope, and council.

It was natural that such a book should provoke a reply: it is strange to find that it produced so much less controversy than the challenge: subsequent writers on the Roman side could not fail to notice it, but no one except Harding had the courage formally to tackle it. As soon as he had finished his *Answer* to the Challenge he began his *Confutation* of the *Apology*, and the two disputes continued side by side. Jewel answered the *Confutation* with his *Defence of the Apology* (1567); and when Harding went yet a step further and wound up with *A Detection of Sundry Foul Errors uttered by M. Juell*, the bishop, disdaining a fresh reply, said what more he had to say in an enlarged edition of his *Defence*. The dispute had swollen beyond all bounds, and the brief, pointed statements of the fifty pages of the *Apology* were in danger of being lost amid the thousand pages which comprise Harding's *Confutation* of it and Jewel's *Defence*. They were, however, regarded for the moment as the sum of the whole controversy, and became the proper equipment of every parish church and of every minister's study.

Its method
and success.

Replies
from
Harding.

AUTHORITIES.—Information as to foreign relations is found in *S.P.*, *Venetian*, *Spanish*, and *Foreign*. For Pius and the prayer-book see Church

Hist. Society Tract lix. For Allen see *Records of the English Catholics*, including the Douai Diaries and Allen's correspondence. For the Council of Trent and the prayer-book see *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xv. 531. Of the controversial books cited there are modern reprints of Pilkington's, Calfhill's, Jewel's, and Cooper's, in the Parker Society collection, which include in some instances the text of the rival book which is controverted. Apart from these the contemporary editions must be consulted.

CHAPTER VI

PARLIAMENT AND CONVOCATION IN 1563

WHEN the new year opened and the long-expected meeting of parliament and convocation became due, a marked development had taken place in the formation of the two rival religious parties, which with growing definiteness were to disturb both Church and State. On the part of the Marian ^{The position of the Recusants, Jan. 1563.} there was little done in the way of strictly religious action: they did not formally quit the English Church or erect rival sees. The internal dispute as to attendance at the parish churches was waxing warmer, but it was a matter of individual conscience and there was no public ecclesiastical policy. Pamphlets encouraging recusancy were spread abroad, and in the north there was some lively expectation of a return to the Marian position; but the outcome of this was political not ecclesiastical action. These hopes centred round the succession to the throne when Elizabeth should be departed or be removed, round the tortuous diplomacy of Philip and the house of his envoy Aquila in London. ^{A feeble plot.} Already they issued in an abortive conspiracy. It was but "an empty business," as the Spanish ambassador called it in writing to his master, and not worth fostering. Two nephews of Cardinal Pole designed that Mary of Scotland should be set on the throne, and that one of them should marry her. Allusion was made to it in the address of the Commons to the Crown, after the opening of parliament, as "a faction of heretics, contentious and malicious papists"; but the government treated it with contemptuous lenity. The only serious outcome was, that it brought to a head the growing indignation of the nation, by revealing to it thus early in the day an insidious connexion

between popery and treason. Great bitterness was felt and expressed in consequence against Marians; bloodthirsty phrases were uttered against the captive bishops, and the Spanish ambassador's position became an unenviable one. Further results were actually stereotyped in the legislation of the new parliament.

On the other hand also trouble was brewing, and a development was taking place in the position of the exilic band.

From many sides there was a cry for reform in ecclesiastical affairs; but the cry meant different things in different mouths. To the archbishop, as he spoke at the opening of the convocation of Canterbury, it meant the reform of medieval abuses, the restriction of pluralities, dispensations, and the like; also the reform of more recent abuses, of the robbery of the Church by the laity in the impropriation of parochial tithes as well as in other less legal forms; or again, reform of that growing negligence of the people in worship which followed upon the Act of Uniformity and its system of enforcing church attendance by civil compulsion. In the mouths of others this cry for reform was an echo from Geneva: the exilic party was chafing at what seemed a mere backwardness to complete a good work that was as yet hardly begun. Profoundly impressed with the coherent system of doctrine and discipline that Calvin had erected on a basis which professed to be pure Scripture un-mixed with human traditions, it was busy with a Genevan propaganda. It made no doubt that within a short time the English Church would be conformed to that model which in its eyes seemed to be the only available rival to Rome. To this end books were being published, such as *The Lawes and Statutes of Geneva*, which described that system with much laudation, characterising Geneva as the place "where sincere religion is wonderfully advanced, error mightily beaten down, virtue exceedingly maintained, and vice severely repressed." No wonder if such a fair prospect was a little tantalising to many, and an impatient cry was gathering force against the delay and the hindrances interposed between them and their ideal—the setting up of the Genevan system and the abolition of all the relics of popery.

The outcome of such a condition of things was a heap of

The reformers
Anglican and
Genevan.

abuses, so visible that the Lord Keeper gave them the first place in his speech at the opening of parliament. The preachers, he complained, are not diligent, the laity ^{Abuses due to the exilic party.} slow to hear and rebellious against authoritative teaching; ministers are few, and many of them are incompetent; discipline is relaxed, so that "every man liveth as he will without fear"; "ceremonies are agreed upon, but the right ornaments thereof are either left undone or forgotten." A specimen of the abuses is afforded at this date at Worcester Cathedral, where both Pedder the dean and Sandys the bishop belonged to the exilic band. The services were reported to be slovenly, and those responsible for them absent and incapable; the married clergy were evading the queen's regulations by keeping their wives and children in some place apart; they were responsible also for the recent devastation of the church plate; copes and ornaments had been divided up among the prebendaries; the organ, one of the most "solemn" in the realm, was destroyed, its pipes made into dishes for the wives of the prebendaries, and its case into bedsteads.

The agitation was also carried on against the prayer-book, its services and ornaments: one prominent preacher boasted "that he had made eight sermons in London against ^{Agitation against the prayer-book.} surplices, rochets, tippetts, and caps, counting them not to be perfect that do wear them." The whole is redolent of Geneva; and it shows that already the conflict was concerned not with the chasubles and copes ordered by the book, but with the bare minimum of surplices and rochets. Many further objections were also being urged to the existing services; and the stock puritan grievances now begin their melancholy career. The wafer-bread is objectionable, the altarwise position of the holy table, the observance of the holy days, the answering of the sponsors and the signing with the cross at baptism, the use of the ring at marriage, the kneeling at communion, and so on. In strange alliance with these protests stood the false sacerdotalism which objected to baptism by lay men and women. For a moment such stumbling-blocks as these were attacked with freshness as well as ardour; and the confidence, that by their removal the Church would soon be brought to the pattern of the best reformed churches abroad, had not as yet been dashed by failure.

When January came, the main ecclesiastical interest centred in convocation. This parliamentary session was from every point of view less important than the preceding one; but this convocation stood out in strong and vigorous contrast with the brief ineffectiveness of its immediate predecessor. Both assemblies had undergone much change. In the House of Commons only fifty of the old members reappeared out of a total of 417; the House of Peers was the stationary element. In convocation the opposite was the case. The Upper House of the convocation of Canterbury was entirely new, except for Bishop Kitchin of Llandaff, who apparently absented himself from the sessions. In the Lower House the change was less violent, though it was considerable, for the recent deprivations had mainly concerned the prelates: out of twenty-four deans only eight had retained their place, and of these only three took any active part in the proceedings; out of fifty archdeacons sixteen had held office under Mary, and eleven of these were in evidence at the meetings; among the proctors, who numbered about seventy, the proportion was probably much the same; so that on the whole it may be reckoned that two-thirds of the House were new members.

The assembling of this body was felt to be a great moment, and the absentees were few. The archbishop, with the love of method and the conservative adherence to precedent which characterised him, had drawn out a directory for the opening, which was very closely carried out. At eight in the morning he left Lambeth in his barge, and dropped down the river to Paul's Wharf; there he and Bullingham, the Bishop of Lincoln, who accompanied him, were met by the officials of his courts, and conducted to the west door of the cathedral. The dean, canons, and clergy were awaiting him in their surplices, and they escorted him to the vestry; the bishops, in their convocation robes, occupied the stalls in the choir; the English litany was sung, followed by the *Veni Creator*, also in English; the Latin sermon came later, and a metrical psalm; the Bishop of London celebrated the communion; all the bishops made their oblation in turn, and subsequently received communion. The convocation was

The new
parliament
and convoca-
tion, Jan. 12-
Ap. 10, 1563.

Convocation's
opening.

then opened in the chapter-house; the archbishop voiced the general feeling by pointing out the need and the opportunity for further reform. Nowell, the Dean of St. Paul's, was elected prolocutor of the Lower House, and formal business was begun.

Careful preparation had been made for the session, and the signs of it survive in two important papers: the earlier is a set of twelve *Articles in substance desired to be granted by the Queen's Majesty*, which forecasts much of what was actually done; the later is much more developed, and under the title of *General Notes of matters to be moved by the clergy in the next parliament and synod* deals with four principal needs—(1) The articles of doctrine; (2) The reformation of the prayer-book; (3) Disciplinary regulations for clergy and laity; (4) Augmentation of benefices.

Doctrinal
settlement.

The earlier part of the sessions was taken up with the first of these subjects: the Forty-two Articles of 1553 were taken up, discussed and amended in both Houses; finally a revised set, thirty-nine in number, was signed by the bishops at the end of January, and by the clergy early in the following month, and was subsequently presented to the Crown for authorisation. When it was issued later on in the year it was with the significant omission of an article on eucharistic doctrine, and the addition of a clause to safeguard the Church's power in decreeing rites and ceremonies, and its authority in controversies of faith. For eight years the Articles appeared thus, and formed the standard of Anglican unity. The way had already been made plain for it, not only by the Edwardine Articles, but also by the formularies already issued in this reign, and especially by the *Declaration of certain principal articles of religion* described above. The secret of their success was the generous and liberal spirit which presided at the discussions, aiming at inclusive rather than exclusive definition, and at the brevity of toleration rather than a prolixity of anathema.

The Articles.

The next step was the revision and authorisation of the larger catechism which Dean Nowell had been preparing: this with the Articles and *The Apology* would, it was hoped, form an authoritative body of doctrine; but the catechism was hung up yet a while between

The cate-
chism left
unfinished

convocation and Secretary Cecil. *The Apology* remained in a semi-official position, and the Articles stood alone.

When convocation turned to its other topics more difficulty was encountered. Both bishops and clergy had been invited to state in writing their views as to reformation. There are extant three episcopal papers—two emanating from Sandys of Worcester and one from Alley of Exeter, and two petitions of the Lower House presented towards the end of January. Some drastic proposals were here made as to the services. Bishop Sandys wished for the abolition of the crossing at baptism, and of all baptism by women; he suggested that the changes should be made by the joint action of the Crown and the archbishop; and Grindal, approving the sentiments, as it seems, noted in the margin that "It can be done in the synod." The *Requests* of sixty-four clergy of the Lower House wished to go further and restrict baptism to ministers; to abolish the answering of questions by sponsors in the infant's name; to exclude non-communicants from the ministration at communion, and to make the intending communicants state at the confession that they "do detest and renounce the idolatrous mass." The latter proposals had little chance of success; the last would have contravened a policy on which the Church at this time was acting with considerable consistency, viz. that of not speaking against the mass itself, but only against the perversion of it as "private mass." A week or so later, another body of signatories, thirty-three in number, waxed bolder still: they desired that the kneeling at communion might "be left indifferent to the discretion of the ordinary," that copes and surplices too should make way for a preaching gown, and that clerical out-of-door dress should not be enforced.

These were but rehearsals; the real scene was enacted in the Lower House on February 13, when six articles about worship were definitely proposed, debated, and voted on. The proposers adopted the view of the thirty-three against kneeling at communion, but were willing to tolerate the surplice; organs were to be removed, crossing omitted, all holy days abrogated except Sundays and "principal feasts of Christ," and the parson compelled to read divine service facing the people.

Liturgical
schemes pro-
pounded,

and some
drastic
proposals
narrowly de-
feated, Feb.
13, 1563.

Strong opposition was raised to any change in the prayer-book, and especially in the custom of kneeling at communion. Thirteen members are recorded to have taken part in the debate—nine who favoured the proposals and four who opposed. When it came to a division there were forty-three persons to support them and thirty-five to reject, but on reckoning up the voting power the verdict was found to be reversed, and the articles were rejected by the narrow majority of one—fifty-nine votes against fifty-eight. This defeat seems for the time to have ended the attempt to make alterations in the prayer-book.

On the third and fourth topics less was done: inquiries were made with a view to augmenting the poor benefices, and a good deal of progress was made in both Houses with a "book of discipline" for clergy and laity. A book of discipline projected. There is much evidence to be gleaned of the nature of the proposals from the various drafts already mentioned, and it seems possible indeed that the actual "book" which was presented by the Lower to the Upper House, and came to grief, was nothing else than a set of *Articles for Government and Order*, known so far only from the headings and summaries printed by Strype in an appendix from Parker's manuscripts.

When convocation turned to parliament in the hope of securing some ecclesiastical legislation, it found the lay mind in a state of ecclesiastical panic, and full of the wild words and projects which spring from ecclesiastical inexperience. Panic legislation in parliament upon ecclesiastical matters. The dangers no doubt were real: the queen's recent illness had raised to the highest pitch the alarms about the succession; the menace of France and Scotland was growing; the fictitious friendship with Spain could no longer be maintained; the mutterings of disaffection could not fail to be heard; and a word from the pope or a movement from France or Spain might at any moment change them into a shout of rebellion. The religious question lay behind all, and this struck terror into the lay mind. Consequently the penalties of recusancy must be sharpened, and the whips of the old Uniformity Act exchanged for some new scorpions. By the measure ultimately known as *An Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Royal Power*, etc., extollers of the Bishop of Rome became subject to *præmunire*

for the first conviction, and became guilty of high treason at the second: the same lot befell also the refusers of the oath of allegiance. Opposition was offered to the bill in both Houses, and in consequence of it some explanatory and alleviative provisoes were introduced; but it does not seem that the measure was materially altered, and Cecil had to excuse it by saying that "such be the humours of the Commons house as they think nothing sharp enough against papists."

Towards the end of the session the parliament took up a bill which originated with convocation, and was designed to improve the procedure in dealing with excommunicate persons. The bishops' draft was greatly enlarged, and in particular a clause was inserted which shows the causes of excommunication to be these—heresy, refusal of baptism and communion, non-attendance at church, and "error in matters of religion or doctrine now received," besides moral offences such as incontinency, usury, simony, perjury, and idolatry. The procedure was thus made far more efficacious and the weapon in the bishops' hands sharpened. The godly discipline, desiderated by the commination service in the lax days of Edward, was thus not only recovered under Elizabeth, but made more far-reaching than it had hitherto been. Indeed, throughout the whole of the ensuing period it was the Church's misfortune to administer not too little discipline but too much. The other proposals of convocation came to nothing: they were a bill for resorting to church and a bill for the augmentation of poor benefices. The former provided that all should attend service on every Sabbath day and principal feast days, and that no work should be done till service was concluded; but it did not define what were to be held the principal feasts. Persons absent from divine service and communion were to be first fined and then held excommunicates. This was apparently not to the taste of the legislators. Still less palatable was anything that suggested that benefices had been impoverished to the enrichment of the laity, and that some reversal of this procedure was desirable. To touch the question of impropriate tithe was as thorny now as it had been in Mary's day; and other expedients were to

Ecclesiastical
discipline
tightened up
by convoca-
tion and
parliament.

be resorted to rather than the recovery of the spoils of the Church.

Independently of convocation and in ^{as}expressed independence of any ecclesiastical intention, parliament ordered that Wednesdays should be observed ^{Civil regulations as to fast-days.} as fish days as well as the Fridays and Saturdays, the days of Lent, and other days which were already by old custom so observed and in accordance with the Edwardine statute. The motive was the maintenance of the navy, and the provision appeared in an act which bore that object in its title. Hitherto a proclamation had been issued every year of the reign to inaugurate the Lent fast, to serve ^{as} a reminder of the other usual fasting days, and to forbid the killing of meat except under special circumstances and for such as had licenses and dispensations: now this became a matter of statute law. The punishment for non-observance of the abstinence had hitherto touched only butchers and the like in form of imprisonment, fine, or pillory, but it was now extended to all persons who without license broke the fast. The civil requirements thus exceeded the ecclesiastical, not only by this new assignment of Wednesdays as fast days, but also by the older requirement to observe Saturdays as fish days. This part of the statute was laxly observed so far as the abstinence on Wednesdays was concerned, and in 1568 it became necessary to issue a proclamation calling attention to the slackness. In 1585 the provisions with regard to Wednesdays were repealed, and only the old fish days retained; and when this new act expired in 1588 a return was made to the older custom of enforcing the fast days by an annual proclamation issued every year before the beginning of Lent. The act of this parliament, unlike the Edwardine acts and the proclamations, entirely disclaimed any religious motive: the order is "meant politickly," and "not for any superstition to be maintained in the choice of meats." The previous regulations had taken the religious question into account only; while ordering the usual abstinence they had condemned the lax medieval view that such days might be observed by no more than a mere change of diet. The State henceforward was silent as to the religious aspect, but the teaching of the Church remained.

The ecclesiastical view of the subject was that fasting "stands in forbearing flesh and eating but one meal a day," and the latter part more important than the former.

The sessions of parliament and convocation came to an end in April 1563, and the administration of the new penal act was to begin: the measures were due to the fears of the laity; but their execution was chiefly placed in the hands of the bishops, who dealt calmly and gently. The rigours which were to follow upon a second refusal of the oath were avoided, since Parker discouraged his suffragans, ordering them to report any refusal, and forbidding them to tender the oath a second time until an answer had first been had from himself. Thus by a courageous act of mercy he nipped in the bud a course of proceedings which observers thought would soon rival the methods of the Inquisition. The actual results were most easily seen in the case of the imprisoned Marian bishops: the opening of parliament had been hailed with a cry for the slaughter of "the caged wolves"; and when parliament rose they were once more summoning up courage for the worst. Here the queen intervened, and prevented the tendering of the oath at all: later in the year, in consideration of the epidemic of plague, the recusant prelates were discharged from their London prison, in spite of popular outcry against them, and moved to a safer and milder form of restraint in the custody of the new bishops.

Two topics which had been in vain before parliament and convocation remained to be dealt with otherwise, viz. the supply of schools and the provision for poor livings.

The needs of schools and benefices. The schools had suffered from the rapacity of

Edward's day: in many places a chantry priest both served his altar and acted as schoolmaster; and when the chantry was dissolved and its endowments confiscated, the education came to an end. The educational system of the country was thus destroyed; and the few schools refounded under Edward were but a sorry set-off against this work of wholesale destruction. Official inquiry had been made in 1562 as to the schools remaining, but nothing was done by the government; and it was chiefly left to private persons to meet the need. In July 1563 the Council instituted an

inquiry into the state of each diocese, with a view to discovering its area, population, and government, as well as the number of churches, chapels, and clergy. Many of the returns are extant, and from them, with the help of a number of earlier ecclesiastical returns, chiefly those sent in after the close of the metropolitical visitation of 1562, a valuable picture may be reconstructed of the inner state of parochial life and of Church organisation.

The dioceses varied greatly in area, in the number of the population and of the benefices comprised in them. In some cases the two last items varied together. Thus the populous diocese of London contained as many as ^{A comparison of the total in} 900 benefices; elsewhere the densest populations were to be found in the eastern counties and in Somersetshire, where the diocese of Norwich had over 1200 parishes, and the diocese of Bath and Wells about 540 in a much smaller area. The vast area of the Lincoln diocese, though not so populous, contained close upon 800 parishes; next to it in extent, within the southern province, were Exeter and St. David's, comprising some 600 and 450 parishes respectively. In the northern province the two vast areas of York and Chester had far fewer: in the latter a system of chapelries prevailed which practically, though not technically, subdivided the unwieldy parishes, so that the 252 parishes included 180 chapelries; Kettlewell parish alone comprised 12, Manchester and Lancaster 6 apiece. The smallest diocese was that of Rochester, which fell short of 100 parishes; Carlisle was but a trifle higher; the smaller Welsh dioceses and Ely and Durham had under 200; for the new dioceses of Oxford and Bristol the returns are wanting, but they clearly belonged to this class.

The question of population, however, did not always go along with the number of benefices. In this respect the returns are more incomplete, since the inquiry was an unusual one; the statistics, therefore, were not at ^{and popular} once forthcoming, and were forwarded subsequently to the return. The 341 parishes of Lichfield contained exactly three times as many households as the 276 of Canterbury, and eight times as many as the 129 of Ely. Some parishes had a merely nominal existence: in 1569, in the diocese of Canterbury 4 were found to have no inhabitants at all, 2 to

consist of a single household only, 3 more of 2 households apiece, and altogether there were 27 parishes which reckoned less than 10 households apiece. Cranbrook, the largest in the diocese, contained 384 households—that is, probably less than 2000 people. The desolate parishes had generally no church, and to this day in some cases at the incumbent's induction the ceremony is performed in a meadow or at a hedgerow. The whole adult population was communicant; this meant 3 persons in every household throughout the diocese of Canterbury. In Lancashire, if two quite separate returns are combined, more strange results emerge. In one deanery there is an average of nearly 10 communicants to every household, in another of over 11; but in others the average falls as low as 5. The data, however, here are not very trustworthy.

More significant it is to consider the state of the clergy. Though there was much that was deplorable, the chief surprise is that after all the changes of the last twenty-five years the state of things was no worse. The clerical body remained almost entirely the same in the first days of the new era that it had been in the last days of the old: a small number were deprived—not more than about 200, so it appears—in the first six years of the reign. No doubt the greater part of the deprivations, and some resignations as well, represent the conscientious scruples of those clergy who could not accept the changes, and the new recruits to the ministry represented very different views. These losses on the one side and gains on the other represent the amount of change which the clerical body underwent, and it clearly was very inconsiderable. Official documents, beginning with the archdeacons' records of 1560 and extending down to these returns of 1563, show a great lack of clergy, a number of vacant livings and ruinous churches, and an amount of absenteeism and other disorders which is very painful; but such things are clearly not the sudden result of the recent changes, but the accumulating consequences of a long chain of causes.

Thus the Archdeacon of London found in 1560 that St. Benet Sherehog had been vacant five years, and two other churches three years. In the archdeaconry of Colchester

nearly one-third of the parishes had neither parson, vicar, nor curate; of Colchester itself it was reported that "there are but two ministers in the town at this present," ^{Cures vacant in London diocese} ten parishes are vacant, and it is significantly added that "all these will not make three men's livings if they were joined together." The archdeaconry of Middlesex had not more than 15 per cent of its parishes vacant, but showed some specially bad features. Of one parish it was reported that there has been "no parson there this twelve years or thereabouts: for about that time came one and did ring his bells; but since they did never know where he was; and one Hugh Barker, minister, serveth the cure." This was not the only instance here of a twelve years' vacancy, and there were others of seven and eight years. Three years later the state of things in the diocese was but little better: out of nearly 850 benefices subject to the bishop well-nigh 100 were vacant. The cause in most cases was, as already noted, the slenderness of the stipends.

No doubt the diocese of London was exceptional, for it constantly represented the effects of religious movements in a more pronounced form than other dioceses; but in these respects the case seems to have been much ^{and other dioceses.} the same elsewhere. In the diocese of Canterbury there is the same story of vacant parishes and decayed churches. In the archdeaconry of Coventry over one-third of the benefices were vacant in 1561, over one-fifth in the diocese of Ely, and one-seventh in the diocese of Rochester. Two years later matters were improved as regards Ely and the archdeaconry, but the same high proportion of vacancies was still found subsisting in the great East Anglian diocese. In the Worcester diocese the proportion fell to 10 per cent. In a similar area—the archdeaconry of Winchester—it rose to 15 per cent; and there was a significant addition that most of the chapels are unserved. Winchester itself vied with Colchester, for 11 of its 14 parish churches were vacant.

Such returns give a startling picture of spiritual neglect. In some cases there was a curate in charge, and the parish, therefore, though vacant was not shep- ^{Evils of non-residence.} herdless; but, on the other hand, the widespread pluralism and non-residence made many a parish which was not

technically "vacant" as destitute in fact as others which were. This evil, again, was no new matter: licenses for plurality and absence had long been greatly abused. In London it was sometimes the incumbent, sometimes his curate, who was reported non-resident; in 19 out of 89 parishes there was no resident minister found at all, and one-third of the clergy were pluralists. Elsewhere the state of things was very uneven, but from 15 to 25 per cent of the clergy were non-resident. Against these abuses some measures had been taken already; and more were to follow. Absence without license was punished by deprivation; but the evil went on.

The cathedral chapters presented some of these scandals in their worst form: the prebends and other benefices without cure of souls had long been tenable not merely by ^{The abuses in cathedrals.} absentees, but by laymen; some time was still to elapse before the second of these abuses was removed, while the first survives in some form to the present day. The metropolitan inquiry of 1561-62 had both of these points in view. At Winchester out of thirteen clergy five were found to be pluralists, at Peterborough half the chapter, and a larger proportion still at Rochester and Wells. At Bangor only the dean was regularly resident, one prebendary occasionally. This chapter was also unfortunate in the other respect, for three prebends were held by lay-lawyers in 1560, and one of them was still in possession in 1562. At Salisbury Peter Vannes was dean; he was returned as a layman though probably in minor orders, and two laymen held prebends; a third, a serving-man, came to the bishop with a papal dispensation, claimed and apparently obtained his place. Vannes was also Archdeacon of Worcester, where again a layman kept him company in the chapter. At Carlisle Sir Thomas Smith, the ambassador in Paris, was dean; "no residence is kept, and no accounts." "Three prebendaries are unlearned, the fourth is unzealous." At Norwich two of the four archdeacons had only subdeacon's orders, and a third was returned as being no priest. At Llandaff three of the laity held prebends, and in the large chapter of Lincoln no less than ten. Parochial benefices without cure of souls were also in some cases held by men who were not priests: such was James Barran, Rector of Solihull, but living on his

fellowship at Oxford. Moreover, in other parishes a boy was allowed to hold the benefice, on the understanding that he was at the time a student at the university.

Two further points remain to be noticed, viz. the number of clergy who were qualified as preachers and the proportion of married clergy. With regard to the first there is great inequality observable in different places. Out of 87 clergy in London 37 were able to preach ^{Preaching power.} and 19 to "interpret," so that there were left only 31 to be classed as dumb dogs; but a slightly later return gave 107 clergy, 45 able and 62 unable to preach, which seems to argue a more critical spirit. In the 13 exempt London churches subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury 6 clergy were preachers and 7 not. Elsewhere the proportion was not nearly so high, except among the clergy of cathedral churches. At Rochester 5 out of the 8 members of the chapter were preachers, but only 13 out of 64 parochial clergy. Even this, however, is a high proportion compared to other dioceses: the Archdeacon of Leicester had only 15 preachers among his 129 clergy, and the Archdeacon of Coventry only 3 among 67. In Wales the number was lower still: in the diocese of St. Asaph only the dean, chancellor, and 5 others could preach; in that of Bangor only 2 men were licensed to preach, but the sanguine bishop had hopes of over 30 more, that they could preach and might do good.

The matrimonial revelations are more curious still: three years had not yet passed since Mary's death, when the metropolitan returns were made, but already 66 out of 107 clergy in the archdeaconry of London ^{The prevalence of matrimony.} were married; and alas! in spite of the precautions of the royal injunctions in demanding, before a clerical marriage was sanctioned, the approval of two neighbouring justices of the peace and the allowance of the bishop, one match at any rate was a failure, for the victim returned himself as *infelicitèr conjugatus*. The proportion of married to single was similar among the archbishop's clergy in London; but outside London it was different. In the home dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester the clergy were nearly equally divided; in the midlands within the archdeaconries of Coventry and Stow only a quarter were married; in the

archdeaconry of Leicester only 9 out of 129. The cathedral bodies, like London, favoured the new views, and, in spite of the royal thunderbolt which had recently fallen, 3 out of 8 at Rochester and 5 out of 8 at Winchester were married. Other chapters were less matrimonially inclined, and at Peterborough the dean apparently stood alone in having taken a wife.

To meet the needs of the desolate parishes, and perhaps also to supply in some respects the place of the minor orders,

a body of "readers" was called into being at the
The readers. early ordinations of the restored hierarchy (January 7, 1559/60). Later no mention is made of "ordination," but of appointment by the bishop or his chancellor, with letters testimonial of admission, and a proviso that readers should be removable. In the meanwhile the experiment had met a need, but had also raised some difficulties. In 1561 the question was re-examined and the readers themselves were reviewed and continued; in 1562 or 1563 they were required to subscribe some injunctions defining their position and work. Besides reading the service and homily and catechising children, a special class of them was authorised to perform the services of burial and churching. But some were inclined to go beyond this, and had to be restrained from preaching, interpreting, or, to use the later term, "prophesying," as well as from administering the sacraments, marrying, or christening except in emergency. It was a bold attempt to grapple with the situation. In many parts of the country one priest had for a time the oversight of two or more parishes with a reader to help him. Thus services were maintained until the dearth of clergy and of stipends was obviated, or a definite combination of benefices was effected. It is not surprising that some of the readers were unequal to their task and that complaints arose in consequence. Against this may be set the fact that others were found fit to pass on into the ranks of clergy. At any rate, by means of this temporary expedient a decade of special difficulty was bridged over, and in later days the expedient has been found worthy of revival, not perhaps identically in the old shape, but in many similar forms.

The fabrics and ornaments of the churches met with little

consideration. The only tendency which at all told against the destructive zeal of the ardent reformer, and the hardly less fatal neglect of the indifferent, was the wish of the great layman of the place to provide or to retain some suitable accommodation for himself in his parish church. As early as 1564 a case is recorded of his securing to himself a ruinous side-chapel and transforming it into a family pew and a family vault. The churchwardens were bound to provide the minimum of ornaments, but this was not in fact done; a battle was impending on the subject, and meanwhile negligence reigned in spite of royal chidings.

AUTHORITIES.—The Worcester abuses are in *S.P. Dom.* xxviii. 35. The documents connected with the business of the convocation are in Strype; and see Cardwell, *Synodalia*, for its acts. Cp. Burnet, *History of the Ref.* iii. vi. record lxxiv. The primate's directory is in Gibson, *Synodus Anglicana*. For the Articles see Hardwick, *History of the Articles*. The *Articles for Government and Order* are in Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. MS. cxxi. Cecil's view of the Commons is in Wright, *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, i. 127; cp. i. 149 for the Carlisle Chapter. The rule of fasting is from Pilkington, *Works* (Parker Soc.), 558. The Edwardine schools are discussed by Mr. Leach, *English Schools*, and cp. Dixon.

The returns about the dioceses in 1563 are in the British Museum, Harl. MSS. 594 and 595, and Lansd. MS. vi. They may be compared with later returns of 1576 in Lambeth MSS. 900, 901, and of 1603 in Harl. MSS. 594, 595. A valuable Lancashire return is in *S.P. Dom.* xxxi. 47. The returns of the Metropolitan Visitation in 1561, with others, are among the Parker MSS. at Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge, MSS. xcvi. and cxvii.

The documents about Readers are in Strype (misdated), Parkhurst's visitation articles dealt with them, *u.s.*, and there are interesting documents in the Exeter Episcopal Registry. See Grindal's *Register* at Lambeth for some appointments as late as 1581 and 1582. See also *Convocation Report on Readers and Subdeacons*, 1904.

The case of the family pew is cited from Parker's *Register*, i. 248.

CHAPTER VII

GRAPPLING WITH PURITANISM

THE clergy who favoured Genevan views went home from the convocation defeated for the moment and dissatisfied, but hopeful as to ultimate success: it seemed to them incredible that reformation should stop where they could see no stopping-place: a little more perseverance, and the whole-hearted reform must win the day. The actual state of cleavage had been revealed only in the Lower House, but it existed also in the Upper House; and when the bishops went back to their dioceses, and a three years' interval followed before they again came together for concerted action, there was plenty of opportunity for divergence of policy. Two of the bishops, Grindal and Parkhurst, had already conspicuously favoured the extreme exilic party; and the diocese of London in particular was so entirely left to go its own way, that in the chaos of the ensuing battle Parker was inclined to lay a very large part of the blame upon Grindal's laxity and maladministration.

Hitherto the services had maintained much of the old dignity and reverence of public worship, in spite of the devastation of some churches, the disregard of the ornaments' rubric, and a tendency to innovate by side winds such as special services for fasts and other particular occasions. The puritan agitation against music and organs had not yet reduced all the parochial worship to the level of the Genevan psalms. Parker, when he went to church at Sandwich, found "the service sung in good distinct harmony and quiet devotion: the singing men being

The cleavage
of parties.

The service
before puritan
ascendancy.

the mayor and the jurats, with the head men of the town, placed in the quire, fair and decent." And it was still worth while for a publisher to print two editions of a book of church music containing services, anthems, and settings for choral communions. The copes not only marked the sacred ministers at the eucharist, but were worn on other solemn occasions, as, for example, by all the officials at the service at King's College chapel at the queen's visit, or by all the Knights of the Garter at their litany and procession on St. George's Day. The grey-fur almuces were also worn on such occasions and in cathedrals. The elaborate decoration of the churches was kept up at weddings and funerals, and the ceremonial and singing at the latter were very elaborate. But a new type of funeral was coming in; the "clerks" were beginning to wear their surplices under their gowns or carry them on their arms, or were themselves beginning to disappear from great funerals altogether. The screen, denuded of its images, still divided the chancel from the nave, and many clergy read divine service within the choir facing east; the queen still kept her cross; and the candlesticks in places stood upon the new holy Tables of wood, as they had formerly stood on the stone altars. The churches were still crowded on great occasions; "an infinite multitude" would still assemble to be present at a great communion service at St. Paul's; the guilds, which had survived the Edwardine havoc, still kept their communion feasts, and the eucharist was not yet thrust into a corner.

But the hatred of externals was a growing power, and was leavening the country; it not only led to the disuse of the outward ornaments, but allied itself with the movement which was transforming worship by exalting preaching at the expense of common prayer and sacraments. While the former change was the more obvious of the two, the latter was far the more important. The quarrel as to the dress of the minister at service was already an old one; the second prayer-book had bowed to the prejudice against the old eucharistic vestments; but, in confining itself to the simplicity of surplice and rochet, it had not escaped objection, as the scruples of Bishop Hooper had showed. Exile and residence

Growing disregard of the ornaments' rubric,

at Frankfort, Zurich, and Geneva had instilled into many others the same scruples. The old arguments adduced by Bucer and à Lasco to Hooper in favour of conformity under pressure were no longer of force in the altered circumstances, and the exiles learnt some to love and some to tolerate the unrelieved black of protestant Germany and Switzerland.

The restoration of the "popish garments" both for ministerial and outdoor dress in 1559 had come as a shock and produced a stubborn resistance; insistence on ^{and increasing signs of} the eucharistic vestments was soon out of the question, and no attempt was made to enforce them. The *Interpretations* had tolerated a lower standard than the rubric prescribed—the cope at communion and the surplice at other services; but even such a concession was flouted. As early as 1561 the surplice was thought intolerable in Parkhurst's diocese of Norwich: the agitation against the habits was actively carried on, and, after the check that it received in convocation, was spurred rather than curbed. In the autumn of 1563, *i.e.* shortly after the prorogation of convocation, Lawrence Humphrey, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, one of the chief actors in the drama, took the stage. He wrote to Bullinger at Zurich, who had already during Mary's reign expressed an opinion adverse to the use of the habits, asking for a new pronouncement on two points. Can the priest's cap and popish surplice, after being so intimately connected with superstition, now be reckoned ἀδιάφορα,—things indifferent? Can such habits be conscientiously worn in church at the command of the sovereign and for the sake of order? There the matter dropped; for the time of the renewed intervention of the foreign leaders in vestiarian disputes was not yet; and a year passed with only low mutterings of a gathering storm.

The early part of 1564 was full of national apprehension: the fear of a French invasion, coming upon the top of the terrors of the plague, seems to have driven ecclesiastical ^{vestiarian troubles.} questions into the background. But when peace was secured with France on April 22, the plague had abated, and the queen had come home from her summer progress, then it became manifest that the government was not pleased with the state of the country as to conformity. Cecil told the bishops

that the queen was determined to have a reform as to the clerical dress. Reports of a decree to be issued against clergy who did not wear the prescribed apparel reached far-off Durham, and evoked two protests, one from the bishop and the other from the dean, each addressed to Leicester, but intended no doubt for the royal favourite's mistress. The bishop forecasted the lengths to which the struggle would go : ministers would sooner leave the ministry and their livings than conform : in the present dearth of preachers it would be calamitous to deprive them. And making early but fairly accurate use of a term which has since been much misused, he affirmed that "it is necessary in apparel to have a shew how a protestant is to be known from a papist."

His forebodings were soon justified : in December, Humphrey, who had delivered the prologue of the drama, again appeared upon the scene with Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, to confront the archbishop and his colleagues, and to open the first act. The champions of non-conformity were well chosen, and their early proceedings were conducted with academic mildness and precision. A series of questions framed in a conciliatory spirit were propounded to them, and answered by them with firmness. The surplice, they held, having been consecrated to idolatry, cannot be held indifferent ; no authority ought to enforce it, nor, *a fortiori*, the cope ; difference of external apparel between clergy and laity is lawful but not expedient ; things indifferent may be enjoined in worship, but only if they have scriptural warrant ; there should be a charitable permission of diversity where there is unity of faith. The debate went on, and was pursued into great detail, so that finally Bishop Guest was found recommending the gown and tippet because they were also worn by lawyers, the cap because a similar one was worn by mourners, the surplice because the like was worn by a horse-keeper and a porter. Ultimately an attempt was made to arrive at a formula of agreement, but with no success, since the two champions continued to claim toleration for conscientious refusal of the habits ; and Sampson had the more ground for doing so, since Cranmer and Ridley had allowed him to "enter into the ministry with this exception." So the first act closed with unresolved discords.

Humphrey
and Sampson
protagonists.

Already, however, the lines of the controversy were well defined, and all its future voluminousness added little or nothing of importance. There emerge clearly the two pre-suppositions which lie at the root of all puritan argumentation and give a deep import to divisions which at first sight seem to be nothing but petty squabbles. The first is the contention that there must be scriptural warrant for everything that is done in public worship; this involves a denial of the authority of the Church to decree rites and ceremonies. When it is pointed out that such a demand for scriptural warrant must not be pressed so as to include small matters of indifferent detail, then recourse is had to the second pre-supposition, viz. that the matters in dispute are not indifferent, being popish, and therefore superstitious, idolatrous, antichristian. Round these two points of dispute the whole revolved: it was all a matter of Church polity; doctrinal difference, as at present, there was none to be seen within the horizon, unless it were the tendency of Cheyney, Bishop of Gloucester, to a Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist. Later on, however, the intimate connexion of doctrine with the disputes on Church polity was bound to make itself clear, and personal characteristic as well as doctrine and polity could not fail to show itself a determining factor in ranging a man as a catholic or a puritan churchman.

The second act opened at the new year with the entry of the queen. In a famous edict dated January 25, 1565, she complained to the archbishop of a lack of regard to unity on the part of the bishops. Their toleration of varieties and novelties has led to open disorder which ought to have been stopped ere this. As on the contrary it is increasing, the bishops must at once take steps to secure uniformity: they must speedily ascertain the amount of existing varieties, novelties, and diversities, either in doctrine or in ceremonies and rites, and take legal proceedings against offenders or send them to the queen for reformation: and they must be more careful for the future whom they admit to benefices. Devised by Cecil and polished by Parker, this mandate was no sooner published than it was sent by the primate throughout the province (through the Bishop of London in the usual way), with orders for a certificate of varieties return-

The underlying principles at issue.

Royal intervention produces revelations, Jan. 1565.

able from every diocese before the end of February. Only two of such certificates survive ; neither of them comes from a diocese, one being from the Chapter at Canterbury and the other from the University of Cambridge ; but the net result may be gathered from a summary of varieties prepared for Cecil in February. The service is said sometimes in the chancel, sometimes in the nave ; sometimes eastward, sometimes westward ; sometimes at a lectern, sometimes in the pulpit ; sometimes with a surplice, sometimes without. There is great variety as to the position of the Table ; at communion the cope is not uniformly worn as well as the surplice, and sometimes neither is used. Similar variety is shown as to the use of chalice or communion cup or common cup ; of unleavened or leavened bread ; as to kneeling, standing, or sitting to receive. The divergences in baptizing and in external apparel are also here set forth, and it is noted that, "while some keep precisely the order of the book, others intermeddle psalms in metre."

At the beginning of March, when the returns should have been sent in, a small body of the bishops of the province met at Lambeth, possibly in conference with Cecil, and took two important steps. They drew up a book of Articles, partly as the result of former agreement and partly as the result of discussion at the time, which they presented to the queen for her authorisation. Simultaneously they began a new bout with Humphrey and Sampson, who had been summoned from Oxford for the purpose. In both attempts failure awaited them. Parker made piteous appeals to Cecil not to allow the whole plan, to which he had been unwillingly driven by the government, to be now spoilt by the backing out of the government : if the queen would rebuke the laxity of Grindal and authorise the Articles, all might be well ; but he declined to carry the matter through unsupported. Unfortunately the queen was in a hesitating mood and was without Leicester, the puritan champion, at her elbow ; the Articles went into a pigeon-hole ; the objectors, after proving obdurate before the ecclesiastics, were summoned by the Council and dismissed with nothing worse than a scolding.

The proceedings hung fire, and all the odium fell upon Parker, who thought himself more powerless than he really was. Being reduced to desperation, he determined to act

on his own authority—a dangerous proceeding in Tudor days and in face of hostile lawyers. In spite of the fact that the champions were favoured by Leicester, and that in the midst of the crisis they had been appointed at his instigation to preach at Paul's Cross, he proceeded to extremities with them. His ultimatum was, that unless they consented to wear the gown with the prescribed cap abroad, and in their chapels a surplice and hood, and to communicate, kneeling, in wafer-bread, they must be deprived. The objectors replied that they could not conform, and pleaded for delay. The sentence fell, and no real opposition was made to the action which Parker took with so much trepidation. In the execution of the sentence he showed himself compassionate as ever; and in the hour of unexpected victory he was glad to be generous to the vanquished.

Parker acts
on his own
responsi-
bility.

A new act of the drama then opened, in which the foreign theologians reappeared. In both the previous stages much use had been made against Sampson and Humphrey of the opinions delivered by Bucer and à Lasco on Hooper's case in 1550; the result was a fresh appeal, and from both sides—if indeed Bishop Horne can be said to represent the bishops' side. In describing the contest to Gualter he blamed the Act of Uniformity, and expressed a hope that the ornaments' clause would be repealed at the next session of parliament: he maintained, however, that it was wrong to relinquish the ministry on account of the habits. The reply of Gualter showed that he agreed with this view, regretting, indeed, the insistence upon them, but counselling submission for obedience' sake only. There followed a much fuller reply to Horne, written by Bullinger, in the same strain; it emphasised the fear that if ministers left their livings, papists and "Lutherans" would take their places, and the situation would be worse than ever. Meanwhile Sampson also had written to Bullinger, but he received no reply. Bullinger knew him of old, and thought him a man of captious and unquiet disposition, who always had a grievance and was always troublesome; so his silence was very intelligible.

The views
of foreign
protestants.

When the new year came it was evident that some transactions had been quietly going on among the bishops. One result of them was that at last the reluctant Grindal

was impelled to take action. The clergy of London were summoned by the bishop and archdeacons to St. Sepulchre's to engage themselves to wear a prescribed apparel: in church ministry this was to be the surplice only; but the external apparel was to be "a round cap with a deep neck," a turkey gown with a falling cape. It was an attempt at compromise. Only eight out of 109 refused it: these were conservatives, who clung to the old habits, the copes, wafer-bread, etc., which were all that they had been able to retain of what they desired, and of what, in theory at least, legislation had secured to them. Meanwhile Parker and Cecil had been busy with troubles at Cambridge, where St. John's College was going through a sharp attack of vestiarian fever. Elsewhere in the country than in London and Cambridge matters had quieted down, but in February a new stirring began at Oxford. Humphrey and Sampson, the veterans of the fray, wrote again importunately to the reluctant theologians of Zurich, and each pressed for an answer to a minute series of questions which he had formulated.

Meanwhile there were movements in high quarters: possibly Grindal's compromise was not well liked, nor the ill-success of repression ever since Parker's hopeful book of Articles had been banished to a pigeon-hole. The course of events is not clear, for there is a gap in the documentary evidence; but on March 10, 1566, Parker had an interview with the queen, and warned her that "these precise folk" would sooner go to prison than conform. Two days later he protested to the secretary that the failure was not his fault; he had done all he could, and without the definite support of the Crown he could do no more. He urged that the recent obedience even of the reluctant to the proclamations about sumptuary rules and the Lenten fasts was in glaring contrast with the disobedience in the matter of conformity, and showed what the queen could do if she would. He therefore returned to the charge, and asked again for a royal authorisation of the luckless book of Articles, holding out good hope that a little strong action in London might, if consistently carried through, secure conformity throughout the country.

The queen refused to take the step, and would not

Proceedings
in London,
Feb. 1, 1566.

Parker fails
to move the
government;

promise more than to send some of the Privy Council to support what action Parker might decide to take on his own account. So once again, encouraged by his previous success, under the guidance now of the lawyers, and with Grindal by his side, Parker laid his plans to proceed to extremities with the clergy of London. He felt that he must be armed with some weapon; he could not have his book of Articles made into laws and constitutions by the decree of the queen as he had originally drafted it, so he would furbish it up with modified phrases of imposing character, which did not formally claim the royal authority, but made the most of such countenance as the queen had given. This toning down of the claims of the document involved the giving up of many points which the archbishop must have struck out with a sad heart; but again a great success awaited the primate's act of courage.

Issuing modestly as "Advertisements," and for the province only of Canterbury, and leaning timidly on the royal injunctions and bygone acts of parliament, the document yet acquired at once a great authority, hardly less than that which it had been obliged to forgo. Contemporaries discerned that the queen's hand was in it, though she took no responsibility in the issue of it. In later days this refinement of the queen's policy and of the archbishop's diplomacy was forgotten: the *Advertisements* were regarded before the reign was over as having had the authority which it was Parker's great complaint that they lacked; the impersonation was so successfully maintained that after three centuries even a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was deceived.

Meanwhile fears ran high, and Parker himself expected a tumult. On Tuesday, March 26, 1566, the day appointed for action, there appeared in the chapel at Lambeth nearly a hundred of the clergy of London before the archbishop and the commissioners. Mr. Robert Cole stood ready dressed in the prescribed habits for all men to see and copy, but the great ones of the Council, whose attendance had been promised, apparently failed to appear, and left the matter to archbishop, bishop, and chancellor. There is no record of the grave discourse with which

but acts only
too success-
fully on his
own part.

The *Adver-
tisements*
acquire a
fictitious civil
authority.

The battle at
Lambeth,
March 1566,

Parker had planned to open the proceedings, but the diary of one who was present gives a vivid though hostile account of the crisis. "The speech of the chancellor was thus: 'My masters and ministers of London, the Council's pleasure is that strictly ye keep the unity of apparel like to this man here—a square cap four-cornered, a scholar's gown priestly, a tippet, and in the church the linen surplice; and strictly keep the rubric of the Book of our Common Prayers of England, and the Queen's Majesty her Injunctions and the Book of Convocation. Ye that will presently subscribe, *Volo—I will*—so write: you that will not subscribe, *Nolo—I will not*. Be brief; make no words: so is the order: peace, peace. Apparitor, call the churches; Masters, answer presently *sub pena contemptus* and put your names.' The sompner calleth Canterbury peculiars first, then some of Winchester diocese, lastly of London diocese. Men's hearts were tempted and tried; and many sequestered and deposed and deprived. Great was the sorrow of most ministers and their mourning, saying, 'We are killed in the soul of our souls for this pollution of yours, for that we cannot perform it in the singleness of our hearts.'"

Thirty-seven refused subscription, "of which number," Parker wrote to Cecil, "were the best, and some preachers." Thomas Earl, the diarist in question, of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, was apparently at first among the refusers, and he mocks those who received promotion as a reward, so he says, for subscription. "But I myself and many others after, *Ego T.E.*, yielded and subscribed; for the bishops consecrated *quosque* and *quibus-cunque* to place in our rooms." The penalty was that designed by Parker,—suspension and sequestration, with deprivation to follow in three months' time if they continued obdurate. "Subscribe we all must to three books, as thus: the Book of Common Prayers, the Convocation Articles, the Archbishop's Book, or else suspension, deprivation—with notes of singularity, puritanism, and slanders of infringing the Queen Majesty's royalty," and so on. Time brought reflection, and before long some of the "recusants"—so Parker calls them, using a word that was soon to denote exclusively the opposite wing of dissension—openly repented

and its after
effects,
favourable

and were restored. Good men were among them, but of the rank and file Parker wrote that he would wish them out of the ministry, as mere ignorant and vain heads.

Simultaneously with this blow struck at the heart of the evil, the archbishop was sending his book of *Advertisements* to all his suffragans, and describing his procedure with the London ministers, in order that others ^{and} might follow it elsewhere. ^{unfavourable.} If he had delayed a few days, he could hardly have still given such an optimistic description of the Lambeth episode; for the disorders which he had feared soon followed, and the diocese of London was upset. It was impossible to supply the places of those who had been suspended. Crowley, of St. Giles', Cripplegate, relieved his feelings by expelling out of his church a funeral procession of clerks dressed in the surplices, and calling them "porters' coats." When charged before the commissioners, he was defiant, and "tended to anabaptistical opinions"; so they deprived him, and confined him to his house to await the Council's pleasure; and a long series of troubles before both Council and commissioners ensued. The archbishop's chaplains and others who came to stop gaps were ill received; in many places there could be no communion for want of surplice and wafer-bread. On Palm Sunday when all was prepared for communion and the Passion was being read, some one "drew from the table both cup and wafer-bread, because the bread was not common; and so the minister derided and the people disappointed." On the other hand, the "precise men" made much of their grievances, and especially of six hundred communicants who had assembled on that very Palm Sunday at St. Mary Magdalene's, Milk Street, only to find the doors shut. Similar disorders and tumults filled London in Holy Week with grave scandal. Grindal the while was conveniently otherwise occupied with a sermon for Good Friday, and Parker struggled on into Eastertide with his herculean task alone, sore at the desertion of the Council, and desperate in the determination to die rather than fail of his duty.

The publication of the *Advertisements* marked a new stage. The handling of doctrinal questions that there had been in the first draft of the Articles was now weeded out, and the rules

were made to rest as much as possible on previous orders of unimpeachable authority ; but there was still much more than what concerned the habits, and decisions ^{The scope of the *Advertisements*.} were included that were now newly published, though they had been long debated among the bishops. The Articles were grouped under four heads : (1) doctrine and preaching, (2) administration of prayer and sacraments, (3) certain orders in ecclesiastical policy, (4) outward apparel of persons ecclesiastical. The most important feature about them was that they laid down the concessions which the ecclesiastical commission was prepared to make by way of securing conformity. With regard to the vestments, the standard was to be neither the rule laid down in the rubric nor the compromise recently set forth in the *Interpretations*, but merely the surplice in parish churches with the addition of a hood at choir services and preaching, and a cope for the three ministers at holy communion in cathedral and collegiate churches. A similar policy of compromise was observable in other respects. Thus the rubric prescribed a communion weekly of all clergy in cathedrals, but the *Advertisements* did not press for it oftener than monthly, nor for more than four communions in the year on the part of the clergy of a cathedral. In other respects, however, there was no mitigation. The external habits must be worn ; communicants must kneel to receive ; god-parents are still to be required and must be communicants ; the tenure of benefices by non-residents, being students at the university, is only regulated, not abolished. All these were points in which no concession was made to growing demands. The document closed with a series of *Protestations* to be subscribed for the future on entry into any ecclesiastical office. At the foot stood the signature of six bishops as "commissioners in causes ecclesiastical with others."

When the *Advertisements* were once issued, the execution was keenly prosecuted. Humphrey complained to the secretary more of this than of the book, urging him to move the queen "to stop the execution, and to suffer the book to sleep in silence." Now, however, ^{Their enforcement quickened by hostile pamphlets,} the Council was forward in the matter, and was busy conventing ministers for non-use of the square cap.

The ecclesiastical commissions were dealing with small and great. The case of Whittingham, the Genevan Dean of Durham, was probably typical. He was harried for a year before he was finally forced into conformity. Even Grindal was enjoining the habits on his cathedral chapter—a most necessary order, for one of his archdeacons had caused scandal of late by appearing at Court in a hat and short cloak. The zeal of the Council was probably quickened by the issue from the press of a number of small books against conformity. Hitherto such things had passed in manuscript; for example, the learned but recalcitrant Turner, Dean of Wells, had so circulated his arguments against conformity. Now, however, perhaps through Crowley and others like him who had left the book-trade for the ministry, the puritan press begins an eventful career. Its first essay was *A brieve Discourse against the outward Apparrell and Ministering Garmentes of the Popish Church*, a little book of some fifty pages hastily got out as the manifesto of the deprived clergy of London. Their four reasons for refusal are given as follows: (i.) the garments offend weak brethren and encourage stout papists; (ii.) the authority of the Prince does not extend so far as to enforce them; (iii.) they are unnecessary, and (iv.) popish.

The book was at once prohibited, the printers imprisoned, and the copies confiscated. But something more was needed to meet the case effectively. Consequently a reply, <sup>inaugurating
a new literary
war.</sup> official but anonymous, was speedily issued by the queen's printer, called *A brieve examination for the time of a certain Declaration*, etc., and at the end of it there figured once again the opinions of Bucer and Martyr, which Parker in every deal had used as trump cards. This reply called forth no less speedily *An answer for the tyme to the Examination*, etc., containing the whole text of the *Examination*, with a detailed reply, paragraph by paragraph. There was a good deal of haggling over small points, such as, for example, whether the alb was or was not in question: the examiner denied it, and the answerer met him by saying that it was in the former book of Edward to which the act refers, and is worn in solemn places by the priest at this day. But most of the discussion is on well worn lines, and the arguments

even at this early stage were becoming threadbare. Other little pamphlets tried to minimise the value of the appeal to Bucer and Martyr, and took the form of *Comfortable Epistles* to afflicted brethren. Soon there were new opinions from abroad to be quoted and wrangled over, and it was necessary to issue an order from both the Council and the ecclesiastical commission restraining the liberty of the press, and preventing the importation of seditious literature.

Early in May the veterans Humphrey and Sampson extracted a new reply from Zurich; simultaneously there came also a reply to Horne and the other episcopal inquirers, which was no more than a covering letter of the reply to the veterans, enclosed by the writers ^{Further foreign intervention} in order that the bishops might be kept aware of the course of the correspondence. In this letter Bullinger and Gualter said that, while they could not have tolerated the use of the old mass-vestments, had these been in question, they could recommend the inquirers to wear the surplice and the cap, square or round, sooner than suffer deprivation for non-conformity. With some evident weariness and irritation at being thus repeatedly pestered, Bullinger then went on to reply to some of the queries of his captious correspondents, and to warn them that they will more edify the Church of Christ by conforming than by leaving the Church on account of the vestiarian controversy.

The advice, no doubt, was as distasteful to the convinced nonconformists as it had ever been; but their friends wavered, and meanwhile the episcopate, even in the person of Grindal or Parkhurst, had been stirred to ^{leads to stronger episcopal action.} take strong action. When Grindal confined Bartlett, a lecturer at St. Giles', Cripplegate, for preaching in defiance of his suspension, his palace was beset by a crowd of women hastening to make suit for him. The bishop—a prudent bachelor—declined to face them, but said that if they would send half-a-dozen of their husbands he would talk with them. A very little of such treatment would have irritated a milder man than Grindal. Consequently, though Parker was still complaining of his laxity, he was mending his ways, and falling into line with the general body of the bishops. They, aided by the Council, were now treating their puritan recusants

to the honourable captivity which had before fallen to the lot of the deprived Marian prelates—thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges—and distributing them among various episcopal palaces.

The letter from Zurich was found by the bishops to be so useful in supporting the conformists and reconciling others that it was speedily published in a new issue from the queen's printer, entitled *Whether it be mortal sin to transgress civil laws which be the commandments of civil Magistrates*. This book contained, besides several arguments on the main question, a veritable *corpus* of foreign opinions, comprising the correspondence of Hooper's day as well as the recent letters, with a reply to a new puritan pamphlet called *A brief and lamentable consideration of the Apparel*, etc. But the correspondence did not end here. The veterans, displeased with their answer, began unabashed to go over all the ground again—Judaism, monachism, popery, pharisaism, antichrist, and all—adding only two new things,—an expression of annoyance that their letters had been published without their consent, and a series of "straws and chips of the popish religion," or "blemishes which still attach to the Church of England." These comprised, besides the usual set of complaints, such matters as the part-singing and organs, the dispensations for plurality, for eating meat on fast-days, for marriage in times prohibited, the veil at churching, and so forth, with a demand for the restoration of the "black rubric."

Disappointed with Zurich, the veterans turned to Geneva, and with Coverdale as coadjutor invoked Beza and his company. In order to ensure the attention which had lately been denied to their requests, they sent envoys who should make both Zurich and Geneva resound with loud wails of grievance. On the bishops' side Grindal wrote in a very different strain; and when Zurich and Geneva compared notes, though some soreness was felt by Bullinger at Grindal's action in printing a private letter without leave, the general result was not to make the foreigners better satisfied with the nonconformists. Their envoys revived the unpleasant impressions which they themselves had left when they were in exile. The description which Wiburn and

Fresh
pamphlets
and cor-
respondence
with Zurich

and Geneva.

others gave of the position in England was found to be very untrustworthy. Bullinger told the veterans frankly that he had never supposed that they would be satisfied; and deprecating finally their vehemence and caprice, he closed the correspondence. The Zurich divines did not, however, cease to try to find a *modus vivendi* for such as would be reasonable, by temperate protests written both to bishops and laity. They even at one time meditated a journey to England to act as mediators; but soon they prudently reflected that such a move would lead to worse complications, and desisted.

But while the puritan envoys exaggerated the evils, and Grindal and Horne in their reply, it must be confessed, went over far in minimising them, it could not fail to become clear that the contest concerned far more than the habits. From the point when the clergy were made to subscribe to the "Advertisements of the bishops" as well as the prayer-book and the Articles of Religion, the controversy spread over a wider field, and one in which the foreign theologians could only part company with the bishops and ally themselves with the Puritans. The last of their remonstrances to the bishops was that sent by Bullinger and Gualter on August 26, 1567. After that no more was attempted, and the correspondence resumed its former shape as a mere friendly interchange of news. The archbishop had long perceived the inner meaning of the controversy, and was well aware that the discontent with habits was only a symptom of a much wider and deeper disease. In March 1565, at the first onslaught upon nonconformity, he warned the secretary that it was not merely habits that were in dispute, but the whole question of rites. Thenceforward the question of habits was only one among many grounds of complaint, and puritanism, following the lines of the catalogue of "blemishes" recently printed, set itself to agitate for a body of reforms which would reconstruct the discipline and worship of the Church.

Nor were doctrinal questions really excepted: though ostensibly there seemed to be the agreement of which all parties boasted, there were underlying differences which were bound soon to emerge. In particular there was a funda-

The true nature of the quarrel emerges.

mental divergence as to the doctrine of the ministry which nonconformity evoked and strengthened. Many accepted episcopacy as a fact without holding it as a doctrinal necessity; and much of the present struggle tended to drive them from this negative position into a positive presbyterian view. The fact that the bishops enforced uniformity was not likely to make their victims cling any more closely to the existing system of episcopal government. It seemed intolerable to them that "popish mass-priests" should continue unmolested in their benefices, and even receive new ones, while godly ministers, fresh from the laying on of hands at Zurich or Geneva, were as ineligible as laymen for benefices with cure of souls, and could only hold other benefices—prebends and the like—on the same terms as laymen and according to a custom which was fast being discredited and abolished by the bishops. Thus gradually nonconformity became a definitely presbyterian organisation, pledged to work within the Church for the abolition of episcopacy, for a new view of the ministry which was not that of the Book of Common Prayer, for a new system of discipline which was not that of the English Church, and for a new scheme of worship which should tolerate much that at present was not tolerated and forbid much that was at present enjoined. The movement was thus not one for liberty of opinion or practice, but merely for the substitution of a new coercive system in place of the old one.

[To modern eyes such a position as this seems an almost impossible one. To remain in a society avowedly with the intention of undermining its principles seems at first sight merely treacherous: to leave it would seem but not yet into separationism; nowadays the only honest course in such circumstances. But secession from the historic organisation of the Church was still to the nonconformists an impossible expedient. The external unity of the Western Church was still unbroken; even the rift between England and Rome was not as yet formal; and in England itself the solidarity of religion was much too precious a thing to be broken up lightheartedly. Moreover, pressure from without combined with conviction within to keep even the revolutionist from leaving the Church

organisation of the country. High political expediency demanded religious uniformity: the expression of other views was rigorously suppressed, and the watchful government would not allow either word, writing, print, or worship which was not of the prescribed pattern. The position, therefore, of the puritan churchman calls for compassion more than for condemnation. Of two rival and equally intolerant parties his was the novel and the weaker party; and therefore his lot was sure to be a hard one until either he could get the upper hand of the more catholic churchman and become the oppressor, or else both sides could learn mutual toleration.

Meanwhile, though the bulk of the Puritans remained churchmen, the beginnings of secession appeared, and both they and their treatment are worthy of attention before this chapter closes. Shortly after the second ^{though separatism begins,} encounter with Sampson and Humphrey in March 1565, to make matters more secure, all the archbishop's licenses of preachers were called in, and licenses were regranted only to such as proved conformable and amenable. This, following upon the defeat of the champions, was a paralysing blow to those whose religion centred round sermons from puritan divines, and who felt bound in conscience to abstain from worship where the surplice was worn. To some of them this tyranny recalled the evil days of Mary; and remembering how then they had braved the authorities and met in secret in the heart of London itself, they began to do the same again, with the important difference that for their service they betook themselves not to the prayer-book but to the Genevan Order, a set of directions in outline for the conduct of services, which had been printed in English in 1550.

But the watchful government was not to be eluded; after a month of secrecy a company of about a hundred were surprised in conventicle on June 19, 1567, at Plumbers' Hall, which they had hired as though for a wedding; and nearly a score of them were taken and imprisoned. ^{and claims its first sufferers.} Seven of them were examined on the next day before the bishop, the lord mayor, and others, and the account of the proceedings which they drew up in dialogue is the earliest extant of a long series of puritan *Acta Sanctorum*. The discussion ranged over the well-worn ground,—the idolatrous

gear which was neither scriptural nor indifferent, the clashing duties of obedience to the Prince and obedience to conscience, and so on. Though the pen is a prejudiced one the bishop is depicted in a favourable light: he reasoned patiently, played Bullinger and Beza as his trump cards, pleaded when argument failed in effect, and endured patiently from the prisoners, on their own showing, a great deal of insolent and unreasonable language. In the end some of them were let off and some imprisoned. After nearly a year's interval Grindal interceded with the Council for them and for others who were under the same condemnation, and with a solemn charge set them at liberty. Such mildness was very charitable, but it was not the way to end the troubles of the diocese. In fact, after the release of these men Grindal was very shabbily treated by them and their adherents. Two ministers, Bonham and Crane, taking advantage of his mildness, not only returned to their former unlicensed preaching and conventicles, but also slandered him to the Council, when he in consequence imprisoned Bonham and inhibited Crane. A few words of explanation easily set matters right with the Council, and showed up a feature of puritanism which was sadly prone to recur. It was, however, the end of Grindal's London experiences: his time there was now drawing to a close, and in 1570 he was translated to York.

AUTHORITIES.—*Zurich Letters, Parker Correspondence*, Strype as before.

The paper of Varieties in the service is accurately printed in Parker, *Did Q. Elizabeth take other order?*, elsewhere often inaccurately.

Documents about the Cambridge disorders are in *S.P. Dom.* xxxviii.-xli.

Dealings about the vestments are in Lansd. MSS. vii. ix. x.; Harl. MSS. 416, 417, 419. Cp. Grindal, *Works*. Earl's *Diary* (Univ. Libr. Camb. MS. MM. i. 29) gives details of the dealings with London clergy (utilised by Strype). For Crowley see *Privy Council Acts*. For Whittingham see *Camden Misc.* vi.

The Privy Council judgment alluded to is that in the case *Ridsdale v. Clifton* in 1877.

CHAPTER VIII

THE "OLD RELIGION"

THE attempt to check recusancy by the heightened terrors of parliamentary legislation was not very successful. The government had indeed in its latest measures chiefly had the Marian in view; and the term "recusant," ^{The double-edged sword of the State.} which at first was applicable without distinction to all who refused conformity, very soon became distinctive of them. But it was the interest and policy of the government to repress equally on both sides any want of conformity to the standard which it had legalised. Consequently repressive measures were issuing forth in two opposite directions at once; and in the Tower, the Counter, the Clink, and many another prison the strange sight now became more and more common of Rome lying down with Geneva, and Geneva with Rome, each enhancing the discomfort of the other.

If the Puritan, repressed and imprisoned for conscience' sake, deserves pity, even more so does the Recusant who shared his prison. The one merely had his reforming zeal checked, while the other had all his cherished ^{Reform as viewed by the Recusant.} traditions outraged that had long been a sacred part of his inner life. To tell the truth, the immediate results of what was called reform were not such as to recommend it to those who loved what was called in the language of the time "the old religion." They heard much of a restoration of purity in faith and worship according to an older model, but what they saw actually before them as the immediate consequence of the change was the desecrating of churches by iconoclasm, the destruction of altars, the burning of the

sacred ornaments of the church, and the derision of the holy ceremonies. The blasphemous parodies of the eucharist were not merely a momentary excess of the first days of reaction, but were held the right sort of entertainment wherewith to amuse the queen and her court when she visited Cambridge in 1564. A great attempt had been made to restore communion; but the immediate result of it was that the celebration of the eucharist became of rarer and rarer occurrence. Again, a gallant attempt had been made to restore the knowledge of the Scriptures, and a system of daily service had been inaugurated, designed to accomplish this end; but the immediate result was the decay of daily service. The recusant in his youth had seen the churches thronged every day by worshippers; now he saw the doors beginning to be closed from Monday to Saturday, the people giving up their daily worship, and coming down to a mere attendance on Sundays and a rare communion made for conformity's sake. It is not surprising that to some, and to some of the best, even the abuses of the old system were dearer than the reforms of the new. The surprising thing is that they were not far more numerous than in fact was the case; and indeed the astonishing readiness with which the reform with all its immediately attendant drawbacks was accepted, is in itself the best proof of the widespread and deep-seated character of the dissatisfaction with the old.

The only one of the Marian bishops on whom the rigours of the new legislation fell was Bonner, who had been in the Marshalsea prison in Southwark since April 20, 1560. ^{The fight with Bonner.} Four years later, after consultation with the lawyers and the written permission of the archbishop first had according to his instructions, proceedings were taken. Horne, as Bishop of Winchester and his diocesan, sent for him to his house and called upon him to take the oath: this he refused to do, and accordingly Horne certified the Court of Queen's Bench of his refusal. Bonner had lost none of his old determination nor of the legal skill on which he prided himself. Inspired by the tumult and mixed curses and blessings of the crowd which watched his transit, and encouraged by the way in which he had carried through to his own satisfaction his actual interview with Horne, he sat down

to draw up a series of objections to the proceedings such as would delight the legist's heart. He denied the authority of the acts of parliament because they had not the consent of the spirituality; he denied that Horne was legally a bishop according to the statutes of the realm and the laws and canons of the catholic Church, in particular alleging that Horne had not been consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops according to statute, and thus impugning the consecration of Parker and his co-consecrators: he further made many technical objections as to his summons, as to Horne's certificate, and so on. The result was a fine legal tangle for the courts to unravel; and a long suspension of the case ensued. Meanwhile much interest was made for Bonner by Spain, much sympathy was evoked for him from those in the country who held with him, and much scandal was caused by the delay in his punishment.

The lawyers, in fact, were in a difficulty; apart from mere technical difficulties of terminology, etc., it could not be denied that Bonner had grounds for his contention that the ordination of Horne and other bishops was not in strict accordance with the statutes of the realm. Various minute legal scruples were possible which it was not wise to proclaim. Did he mean, for example, to call in question the legal validity of the *suppletus* clause under which Parker's ordination had received an odd civil sanction? or to call attention to the fact that the sanction of the Ordinal had been carelessly omitted from the provisions of the Act of Uniformity? In either case there would be difficulty. So the case was suspended till it could be dealt with at the next session of parliament. Meanwhile Bonner in the Marshalsea had the cold comfort of knowing that he had placed his enemies in a very awkward and humiliating position.

In the new session of the autumn of 1566 an *Act declaring the making and consecrating of the archbishops and bishops of this realm to be good, lawful, and perfect* set right the position of the episcopate in the eye of the civil law; the lawyers rectified their mistakes with the best grace they could and with a superabundant parade of legal language. But the act was not got through parliament without difficulty. The Lords would not pass it in

His technical
objections

necessitate
parlia-
mentary
rectification.

the form in which it came up unopposed from the Commons, but added a proviso, that only the acts done by the bishops in discharge of their office were confirmed, and, moreover, not such as related to life and property. This was meant to invalidate the action which the bishops had taken in administering the oath, and so save Bonner and others from the consequences of that action. The bishops were thus likely to be baffled; and, moreover, they were afraid that the terms of the proviso would make possible a revision of their management of their own estates and property, which in some cases had not by any means been unimpeachable. While the proviso went down to the Commons, they therefore held conferences on the situation: the result was that a new form of the proviso was put forward in the Commons to supersede that which had been introduced by the Lords. Though the new proviso also invalidated the action taken hitherto about the oath, strong counter efforts were still made both to defeat the bill, and failing that, to foil the attempted rehabilitation of the episcopal position by inducing the queen to withhold her consent. They proved, however, unavailing: the Lords accepted the new proviso, and when parliament rose on January 2, 1566, the bill became law.

The main subjects of general interest in this session were the succession to the throne and the queen's marriage.

Other action
in parliament,
Sept. 30,
1566-Jan. 2,
1567.

Parliament, reflecting the feeling current in the country, was seriously perturbed at the outlook: the queen was still unmarried and had several times of late been seriously ill: in the case of her death the claimants were many, and the most pressing claim, that of Mary of Scotland, was a serious menace to the existing policy. The determination of parliament about this question of succession was exceedingly distasteful to the queen: she resented it imperiously, and a severe tussle was the result. Harmony was ultimately restored, but the question seemed no nearer settlement than before.

The convocation which sat concurrently with this session concerned itself only with a subsidy; but some ecclesiastical proposals came up in the Commons which, though abortive at the time, were significant of what was to come. Five or six bills about religion were introduced into the Commons. One,

designed to give statutory authority to the Articles of Religion, was passed by the Commons and made its way to the Lords : there, after the first reading, it was stopped by order of the queen, who was angry at the proceeding, and blamed the bishops as authors of the bill. They protested to her that they had had no part in its inception ; but they urged her strongly to allow it to proceed. This did away with the mollifying effect of their disclaimer ; and the Spanish ambassador chuckled over the interview as having been a *mauvais quart d'heure* for them, flattering himself too that the net result of the parliament, which the queen abruptly dissolved, was favourable to him and to his friends. He probably misunderstood the queen's action : it was not so much the proposal as the manner of introducing it that raised her wrath. Her real quarrel was not with the bishops but with the Lower House, which sulked when the queen stopped the bill. Indeed, a whole series of such sharp measures was eventually needed in order to teach the House of Commons that it was not its business to take the initiative in ecclesiastical affairs, but was, on the contrary, an infringement both of the rights of convocation and of the royal prerogative.

Bonner's triumph was no barren success ; it did much to ameliorate the position of recusants. It is difficult to ascertain the extent of their temporal woes : finding themselves, like the Puritans, unable in conscience to attend the services of the Church, they were subject to much harrying, and no doubt were fined merrily. But when they sought to worship God in their accustomed way, they fell under severer penalties ; for the saying or hearing of the Latin mass was a crime, whose penalty might rise from fine and imprisonment to *præmunire* and even to the punishments of high treason. Thus not only was the active propaganda of popery highly penal, but the very exercise of the old and well-loved worship. There are no sufficient records to make possible an estimate of the amount of these griefs. The greater part of the work of administering the law was left to the ecclesiastical commission, though it lay also within the sphere of the regular tribunals. Besides the central commission it was found necessary to have separate commissions for various dioceses and districts where recusancy was widespread.

Attempts at
ecclesiastical
legislation
lead to the
queen's inter-
vention.

The pains
of the
Recusants

Behind the commission stood the watchful Council: it had been busily occupied in 1564 in scrutinising the list of justices of the peace throughout England; it was always ready to be invoked and to intervene when the commission was defied or eluded; its power was wide and uncircumscribed, and it descended abruptly on the unwary. When Anthony Harman of Winchester succeeded in fleeing, and his wife, being two years excommunicate, failed in a similar attempt, not only was the lady caught and sent to the Marshalsea, but the mayor and bailiffs of Winchester were summoned up to London and sent to share her prison for a fortnight for contemptuously refusing help to the man sent to apprehend her.

All this was oppressive enough, but it fell far short of the oppression which the law intended; fines and imprisonments were burdensome results of fidelity to conscience somewhat mitigated. even in the sixteenth century, and in a generation fresh with memories of Mary's sterner methods; but for the time it was happy that matters were no worse. Parker's gentleness had spared most of the Marian bishops the extreme rigours of the law, and Bonner's successful resistance suspended at any rate for the moment the tender of the oath and the dire consequences of refusal. At present nothing more serious happened than the fining of recusants and the imprisonment of those who said or heard the Latin mass. The result was threefold: many of the richer people spontaneously left the country, or behaved like Caley the printer, who, "being accused to have been the beadle and gatherer together of a number to sundry places to hear mass, was sent for to the commissioners, and thereupon is fled and gone." Others, when pressed by fines or the threat of imprisonment, made occasional attendances at church; and, finding nothing worse than scripture-reading, psalms, and prayers, wavered in their recusancy or became conformists. But others, especially in certain strong centres, prepared to resist to the end, and resolved sooner to risk the terrors of the law than the guilt of apostasy.

In London, though it was the main centre of innovation, there was also much recusancy. The influence of foreign countries was strongly felt there. The emperor petitioned the queen for some provision to be conceded for the Latin

worship; but he was only informed somewhat proudly by her that as the English religion was no novel or strange one, but the old one established upon the consent of the Fathers, such variety of rites would be inadmissible. Trouble centred round some of the embassy chapels; the Spanish ambassador particularly posed as a protector of recusants, and his house served as a centre of disaffection. Bishop Quadra's plottings were well known to the government, and were treated with a very British contempt for tortuous machinations. When he died in poverty and disgrace, Don Guzman de Silva was sent to succeed him; and in order to continue the policy, he was instructed to encourage and support the Recusants, and win them for the king of Spain with such secrecy, dissimulation, and dexterity as to give no cause for suspicion. He was therefore ready, if necessary, not only to support the emperor's proposal and to remonstrate on behalf of the captive bishops or other conspicuous men, but to go bail for those who were imprisoned, to aid others to escape, as Quadra had done in the case of the notorious Dr. Story, and to provide those who remained with secret opportunities of confession and communion. The encouragement thus provided by Spain was not without its result. The ambassador wrote very sanguinely about the growth in number of his *protégés*, and fancied that they commanded a majority in the country: he was apt to consider many things—the queen's performance of the Maundy with crossing, or a preacher's assertion before her of the reality of the presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament—to be signs of returning popery. But there was no doubt that a Spanish and Romanist party was forming round him, and it grew till Parker could speak in 1569 of the diocese of London, then vacant after Grindal's translation, as "a busy governance, specially as these times be when papists (the queen's mortal enemies, pretend what men will) have gotten such courage"; and a special corner could be marked off in the great nave of St. Paul's, side by side with the rendezvous of business men and gossips, as "Papists' Corner."

Foreign influence on their behalf in London.

Oxford was another centre of recusants. The traditional conservatism of the university had a wide influence: the earlier episcopal visitations of 1561 and 1562 had done little to

break up the nucleus of disaffection there, and further strong measures were necessary. The archbishop had to deal strenuously with Merton College, and Horne was busy with others which were subject to his visitation.

Parker and
Horne again
visit Oxford,
1566.

At Corpus in September 1566 he found not very much to complain of beyond the conduct of George Atkinson, a chaplain, who was charged with "praying upon" a papistical book and abusing Mr. Rudd for not crossing his forehead on entering church. He admitted that he had brought in Marshall's book *Of the Cross*, and that being "somewhat melancholious of nature" he was sometimes provoked to swear. He was expelled with five or six others; injunctions were given, and some doctrinal articles signed. The struggle here came two years later, when Horne found himself so overmatched that he was forced to invoke the aid of a royal commission. Trinity and Magdalen in 1566 were in better order.

The chief centre of trouble was New College. Here were found "seditious books" from Louvain, and many that would not sign the Articles. Bland had beaten Pearson *atrociter* (*non atrociter* he pleaded), urging "He is a minister, *ergo* he is a knave," and calling all protestants "bruter than very brute beasts." Warden White was in great disgrace, and was summoned to answer lengthy sets of articles. On his return he was accused by his fellows of having turned traitor; in reply he did "curse and bann himself if he were not as catholic and sound in religion as any in Oxford"; and in proof of his soundness thereafter he used his old mattins book in the church. After two serious bouts in September 1566 and March 1567, fifty-eight injunctions were issued to remedy abuses: the foreign books were to be eschewed; ordination was not to be shirked; the litany was to take the place of the old daily mass and all were to attend; turning to the east at the *Gloria patri* was forbidden; pictures and images were to be destroyed and the chapel gutted and whitewashed; thenceforward only scriptural texts were to decorate the walls—such were the dour orders of Bishop Horne.

Parker in his visitation at All Souls found hopes still cherished of a revulsion of feeling. The old superstitious plate and a number of the old service-books must be destroyed as "monuments of superstition." On the

All Souls.

other hand, some "vestments and tunicles, which serve not to use at these days," were preserved: they could not be treated officially as "monuments of superstition," being legal ornaments, though not in use; but there can be little doubt that they met the same fate as the rest, only more quietly.

This procedure was significant; it was probably repeated in other parts of England where the Edwardine ornaments had survived. A clear parallel is known in Lincolnshire, where a hundred and fifty parishes were called upon in 1566 to surrender their "monuments of superstition," and to account also for the way in which the ornaments had been dealt with since the beginning of the reign. The returns tell a history of eight years of destruction; but in many places the ornaments were still remaining, and they were only now destroyed in response to the inquiry. Vestments, cruets, censers, and even copes and chalices, were then doomed to the same fate as the images or altars, crismatories or paxes; albs were changed into surplices for the minister or rochets for the clerk, and some copes became coverings for the communion-tables. But in many places the copes escaped, and were retained with the sanction of the bishop and arch-deacon, being expressly distinguished from the "trumpery and popish ornaments"; and further, there are instances of a more liberal interpretation of the orders about ornaments, and of the retention of vestment, alb, sacring bell, censer, cross, candlesticks, apparently with the like sanction.

The University of Cambridge was of a very different temper from Oxford: it had been full of protest against the surplice; and when the Latin prayer-book appeared in 1560, ^{Difficulties of the same sort at Cambridge.} authorised for use in colleges, and containing special features of its own—in regard, for example, to the reservation of the sacrament and communion at a funeral—it had been objected to as being "the Pope's dregs." But this state of things was only reached as a consequence of the gradual weeding out of "divers stubborn papists and head adversaries of God's true religion to the number of forty and more" by the efforts of the ecclesiastical commission and the Council; and even so there survived till 1570 a provost at King's who insisted upon the adoption of the eastward position in celebrating in the college chapel, and having buried his

popish pelf, watched jealously over it, in the hope that it might serve for another day. Similarly at Caius, the founder was hoarding "popish trumpery"; it was not discovered till the end of 1572, but then by consent of the heads the books and more idolatrous ornaments were burned, and the rest defaced.

Outside England a series of recusant strongholds was now being erected on the other side of the Channel. Louvain was the first great centre of the refugees. Its university offered a congenial home to students displaced from Oxford or Cambridge, and from thence there issued forth the books of controversy, which it was impossible to print, and difficult even to circulate, in England. Thither went Harding, Stapleton, Smith, Sanders, and many of the chief controversialists. With them went refugees of a more miscellaneous sort, such as Nicholas Wendon, Archdeacon of Suffolk, who was a thorn in the side of his diocesan, because, being no priest, he clung to his emoluments and went about in a lay cloak with a Spanish cape and a rapier; or Moore, who after a short experience at Louvain and Rome, came back to England and the Church of his baptism. At Antwerp was another fortress, whence Marshall and Dorman shot their bolts, and where Dr. Story, in congenial proximity to the Inquisition, served Alva by searching for heretical books.

At Douai there were the beginnings of a more permanent stronghold of Romanists. The university had only recently come into being, and Dr. Richard Smith had been brought from Louvain to be its first chancellor.

But a more distinguished man was to follow him in bringing English life into Douai. Allen, after those three years' activity which had made England too hot for him, had been forced to a second and final exile. In 1568 he was the means of founding the English College at Douai, and setting on foot a work of great and lasting influence; for Douai fulfilled its purpose by sending its "seminary priests" to England to take the place of the older generation of recusant clergy, and to brave the persecution which more and more gathered round those who clung to the obedience of Rome. This was not exactly the founder's original intention: his first aim had been to make a centre abroad where English students

Recusants
in exile.

The College
at Douai.

could gather, and clergy could be quietly trained in view of the recovery of England, which he imagined to be not distant. But Allen's priests soon found that it was their policy not to wait for a peaceful opening, but to hurl themselves into war.

The conflict was begun, and the appeal was even made to the stern clash of arms, long before any of the "seminaries" were prepared to take their gentler part in it; for by the year 1569 the disaffection, which had always ^{Disaffection in the north,} been at its strongest in the north of England, had developed into open rebellion. The northern character combines much conservatism with a strong progressive spirit. The north had provided many of the chief leaders of the reformation, such as Latimer and Coverdale in the early days, or Grindal, Pilkington, and Lever at the later period; but it remained, on the whole, deeply attached to the traditions. Again, there survived there much of the old feudal spirit which the wars of the Roses and the Tudor administration had killed off elsewhere. The great nobles had much power, and used it in the conservative direction. Bishop Best's difficulties in the diocese of Carlisle have been already recounted (p. 67). In North Wales the Bishop of Bangor, at the end of 1567, found "images and altars standing undefaced in the churches, lewd and undecent watches and vigils observed, much pilgrimage-going, many candles set up to the honour of saints, some relics yet carried about, and all the country full of beads and knots." Eastward in Yorkshire things were no better: the Latin mass was being said daily, in spite of the Council of the North and its president the archbishop; and northwards again, in the diocese of Durham, there was at least "backwardness in religion."

Bishop Downman of Chester had been carrying on a slack resistance to the Recusants ever since his first entry into the diocese. In 1562 he had been granted a special ^{especially the diocese of Chester.} ecclesiastical commission for his diocese; but two years later his brother of Durham, visiting in his native Lancashire, complained greatly to Parker of the laxity of the bishop's government. The ferment was going on unchecked, but also unobtrusively. The work which Allen had left was carried on by others, who were also successful in convincing many of the claims of the Roman see, of the

truth of its doctrine, and of the unlawfulness of attendance at their parish churches.

At the end of 1565 a new era opened. Michael Ghislieri, the drastic friar, the life of the Roman Inquisition, ascended

The new
pope, Pius V.
(1566-1572),
and his
envoys.

the pontifical throne on January 7, 1566, and a new
papal policy with regard to England was begun.
His two predecessors had been more restrained than
could have been expected; for it had been Philip's
policy to avoid an open rupture, and to curb any hostile
initiative. But the leaders of the Recusants who favoured the
strict view found a congenial atmosphere when they turned from
the Escorial and approached the Vatican. Pius, in full consistory, granted authority to Sanders and Harding to reconcile
those who had conformed, from the schism in which, as it
was now declared, their conformity had landed them. This
declaration was enforced by strong language against "the schismatical service or damnable communion now used," which
the pope's agent employed as a gloss upon the official decision.
Sanders and Harding did not themselves venture to England
to impart to their sympathisers the benefit which had been
granted them, but they sent Lawrence Vaux, late Warden of
the College at Manchester, fresh from a personal interview
with the pope, to be their agent of the new policy. His
reception was not altogether favourable: the lax party took
pains not to understand his instructions, and to withstand his
decisiveness. Thereupon he fulminated threats of "a definitive
sentence that all such as offer children to the baptism now
used, or be present at the communion or service now used
. . . do not walk in the way of salvation."

Such bigness of asseveration has always a power with
some; but this thunderbolt, on the whole, fell harmless, and the

The
beginning of
organised
resistance,
1567,

persistent exiles applied for more. Three of them
this time recounted how the previous faculties had
been flouted; and asked for and obtained a more
definite written authorisation in the form of a bull
of reconciliation, dated August 14, 1567, to which there was
added a solemn form of absolution from all irregularity and
excommunication. It is not clear how this reached England,
but its effect is probably discernible in a report sent abroad
by the recorder of Chester in December of the same year,

that numbers of the gentry of Lancashire have bound themselves together by an oath "not to come at the communion nor receive the sacrament during the Queen's Majesty's reign."

The government was roused to take action, perhaps by such reports from the country, perhaps by secret information from Rome, where, as everywhere else, Cecil had his spies. In January 1568 a series of letters to the ecclesiastical commissioners of the diocese was drafted, calling attention to these attempts to "withdraw men away from allegiance and conformity." A month later orders were sent for the apprehension of some "deprived ministers who have been secretly maintained in private places," endorsed with a list of six names, amongst which were those of Vaux and Allen. At the same time a severe rebuke went to the bishop for his slackness. Hitherto Lord Derby had been left to do the bulk of the work of the commission, but now the bishop was to stir himself and see that the cures were filled with sound men, and that the deprived were not making mischief.

In May the disaffection received not merely an impulse but a rallying point; for Mary of Scotland fled into England, where her charms, her misfortunes, her religious tenacity, and her proximity to the English throne, gathered round her the forces of a discontent that was fast ripening into rebellion. She sought protection, but she found captivity; and then began the sad series of inquiries and transactions which sullied the names of both the rival queens, and only ended with Mary's execution, leaving for historians a rich legacy of controversy and problem. The Earl of Northumberland was early at her side, while the power of Spain and the policy of the new Spanish ambassador, Guerau de Espes, supported her cause, and ruined it by pride and precipitancy.

Meanwhile the Lancashire league grew apace; the nobles of the north mustered their forces; the clergy struck against the prayer-book, and closed the doors of their churches. The commission was still paralysed by the bishop's persistent inactivity. Though his officials were warning him that "this confederacy

and of
government
action.

Mary comes
south,
May 1568.

The Council
strikes at the
Lancashire
league, July
1568.

will grow to be a commotion or rebellion," his reply was that he had visited the whole diocese in the summer and found the people very tractable. But in fact the commission also set to work in the summer and sent up to the privy council ten obstinate Lancastrians who had refused to answer on their oath. The policy was successful: all except one came back and answered. Their history is illuminating: though five of them had attended church in recent years, and one had once communicated, they all admitted that they had entertained recusant clergy such as Allen, Vaux, and the rest. On their promise to reform they were discharged on recognisances, with the understanding that they would go to church on Sundays and Holy days; receive "the holy and blessed communion" before All Saints' Day and three times a year; go to sermons within three miles; not harbour any of a dozen named recusant clergy, nor any like them. The tenth, Sir John Southworth by name, was sent by the Council to Parker, in the hope that gentleness might overcome stubbornness; but the knight heeded neither the consideration of the councillors, who were anxious not to press the case to the violation of conscience, nor the arguments of Parker: he would not sign the form of submission tendered to him, but promised not to entertain disordered persons, and asked leave to retire abroad. This apparently was not conceded, for next year he was in trouble again at Bath and summoned to the Council. This time he was sent to Grindal and to Dean Nowell of St. Paul's, who had already shown his capacity for reconciling Lancastrians by his preaching during the previous year; but it was all of no avail: he seems to have been released from prison for fear of prison sickness, and then to have escaped abroad. In October the story of Vaux's letter became public, for it had succeeded in converting one of the chief opponents of the policy of strictness, for whom it was written, Sir Richard Mullineux. When tackled by two of the recusant clergy, Norris and Peel, both men of many aliases, he gave way, and with his family and others received absolution at Peel's hands, "as he did report that he had the pope's authority." In October he was under examination by the Chester commission.

Such proceedings illuminate the dark places of the history;

and no doubt similar occurrences to these in Lancashire were going on quietly in the other northern dioceses also. The evidence of this becomes clearer early in the new year, when a new envoy, armed with 12,000 crowns from the pope, in the person of Dr. Nicholas Morton, landing in Lincolnshire, became very active in Yorkshire and further north. Not content with reconciling the nobility and gentry to Rome, he further busied himself in stirring up definite rebellion. When many scrupled to go to such lengths against their sovereign, he explained that the pope had now pronounced her heretical and excommunicate, and that consequently she was no longer their lawful monarch. This was a little premature, and many disbelieved Morton; but the agitation went on upon several different bases.

The question of Mary of Scotland was pressing; and in spite of commissions to settle it which sat first at York and then in London, it was not settled. Some there were that in full loyalty to Elizabeth wished Mary to be declared her successor, to marry the Duke of Norfolk, and give guarantees for the maintenance of the reformed religion. To others the adhesion of Mary to the old views was her chief recommendation: their hopes rose high of "a golden day" of restoration soon at hand; and, whether they held with Morton or not, they were anxious to press her claims. Thirdly, the actual heads of conspiracy were dissatisfied with what seemed to them half measures. Norfolk, who at first took the lead, wavered and fell, and was sent in disgrace to the Tower on October 8, 1569. Then the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland came forward and promised the Spanish ambassador that, with the prospect of a little help from Spain, they would take up arms, release Mary, and play the Spaniards' game.

The government was already well informed of what was taking place: for some time military preparations had been in hand, and even the clergy were being called upon to provide armour. Searches had been made for vagabonds and suspicious people all through the country; in June the order was renewed in Yorkshire, and the high sheriff was instructed to prevent people passing in the night with watchwords to raise or levy people as had

Similar
developments
in Yorkshire,
1569.

Definite
moves
towards the
northern
rebellion,

and
counter-
moves.

been attempted. The summer rumours died down, but on October 6 the Earl of Sussex, the president of the Council of the North, heard reports of a rising to begin that night. The night passed quietly, but a week later a body of rebels under arms was reported from Kirby Moorside. Sussex sent for the two earls, who on oath protested themselves to be peaceable, and were at first discharged; then as suspicion grew and their answers became less satisfactory the queen summoned them to London, and they replied by raising the standard of revolt and writing simultaneously to the pope for his help and blessing.

In the middle of November the news spread fast that the Latin mass was set up again at Durham: it reached the sheriffs and justices of Notts just as they were met to put their signature to a declaration of conformity to the church services, which the Council had recently demanded as part of a scheme for laying recusancy bare. From them and from more official sources the news came to the government, and soon it was known everywhere. It was the first open act of the earls and their confederates, and there followed the issue by them of a proclamation, announcing as their purpose the restoring of "the true and catholic religion," and the ridding of the realm from the queen's disordered and ill-disposed counsellors. Though supported by many of the principal gentry, the earls were no fit leaders for such an enterprise, being men of inferior capacity and of dissolute character. The response from adherents was slow and small, nor was their command of their own country secure. Newcastle, for example, having been warned by Whittingham, the Dean of Durham, an old hand at such enterprises, was fortified against them and became a refuge for the loyalists. The rebels emphasised their devotion to the mass at Durham and elsewhere by desecrating the holy Table and tearing the Bible in pieces; but in spite of this they kept up the proper appearance of a religious crusade by the wearing of crosses, and a due resemblance to the Pilgrimage of Grace, in 1536, by carrying a banner of the Five Wounds. The struggle, such as it was, was defined on both sides by religious views; for the Council drew up orders to Sussex for frequent sermons and the daily recitation of the litany in the army, at which all

The rebellion
takes shape,
Nov. 1569.

the principal officers were to attend, and thus show themselves suitable for employment in such a cause.

On November 24 a proclamation issued from Windsor describing the rise of the insurrection, declaring the earls to be rebels and traitors, and calling on all loyal subjects to suppress their enterprise. Four days later Sussex put out a proclamation on his own account, replying in detail to the proclamations of the earls.

Its brief progress and utter collapse, January 1570.

They, meanwhile, had dropped much of their religious plea, and were posing as "favourers of God's Word," who only wished to clear up the succession to the crown. At the outset, thanks to their preparations and the pope's subsidy, they were the better equipped both in arms and money, and for a moment there was danger that a swift southern course might bring them to the gates of Tutbury Castle and to the rescue of the Scottish queen; but she was speedily removed to Coventry, and the insurgents, without policy, plan, or even point of attack, scattered and retreated ignominiously before the approach of Sussex and Warwick. Finding a refuge in Scotland, the fugitive earls at the beginning of the new year caused jointly much broiling and many miseries. Then their ways diverged. The dissolute Westmoreland escaped to the Low Countries, and became an impoverished pensioner of Spain. Northumberland, after two years' imprisonment in Scotland, was meanly bought by the English government for £2000, tried and beheaded at York. His misfortunes and death, together with some piety in his adversity, have recently won him the honours of beatification at Rome.

To stay the evil poison of sedition, the press was busy reprinting *The Hurt of Sedition*, with which Sir John Cheke had confronted the rebels of 1549, and issuing similar pieces in prose and verse. But sterner business was also going forward. As the insurgents had had their reminiscences of the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, so the government now had its reminiscences of the suppression of the revolt of the west in 1549, both in demolishing the bells that had rung to raise rebellion, and in making notable example of the rebels on the gallows. Regarding mere decimation as a half-measure, Sussex condemned twenty per cent of those who had risen to be executed in

The measures of retaliation.

methodical vindictiveness; and though it is probable that the executions were not carried out in full measure, the bloodshed was terrifying. Fines from the rest made a plenteous harvest for a sovereign who was chronically impecunious, and parliament's aid was invoked to secure them to her, instead of their accruing in natural course to the bishop of Durham as prince of the county palatine. There still remained work for the ecclesiastical lawyer to do in distributing spiritual censures to those who had heard a mass, burnt church books, erected altars and the like, or who had been reconciled to Rome. Finally, pardons were granted by the Crown to those who on oath would repudiate the oaths of rebellion, and swear allegiance to the queen and approbation of the royal supremacy.

The attempt of Leonard Dacre in February 1570 to revive the rising in Cumberland was treated more leniently. It had

A subsequent
attempt in
Cumberland,
1570.

been better managed, and had led to the most serious engagement of all; but his people were deceived as to the real issue, and, moreover, the actual loss in battle was serious enough to make further bloodshed superfluous. A merciful pardon was extended to the rank and file by a proclamation of March 4, on condition that, after instruction by discreet preachers as to the heinousness of their offence, they submitted themselves to the queen's officers.

Of more permanent value than any other document evoked by the rising is the *Declaration of the Queen's proceedings since her reign*. Though at the time it proved abortive,

The queen's
Declaration
drawn up,

since its issue was apparently stayed by Dacre's afterglow, it is a most valuable contemporary exposition of Elizabeth's policy. After rehearsing the gentleness of her rule, the mildness of her justice, the defensive character of her arms, and the peaceableness of her kingdom, as compared with foreign countries, the queen turned to the ecclesiastical policy of England as a thing singular and much misunderstood or misrepresented. Her authority now asserted is said to be no more than her predecessors enjoyed, though it has of recent times been more clearly recognised: it involves no claim to define the faith or change the ceremonial from the form before received and observed by the Catholic and Apostolic Church; still less does it involve any claim to

minister the word and sacraments. It involves the duty inherent in a Christian prince of seeing that the subjects live in the faith and the obedience of Christian religion, and that the ecclesiastical government is duly carried on; no further inquisition is made as regards faith, so long as people profess the Christian faith defined by Holy Scripture and the creeds, nor as regards ceremonies and externals, so long as people are outwardly conformable. As to the papal claims to override and supersede this authority, when the occasion offers of an impartial, free, and general assembly of Christendom, such an answer shall be made as will prove satisfactory; or failing this, the policy shall be amended as truth and peace shall require. Meanwhile, if there must be severity for the disobedient, there is still gentleness and consideration for the obedient, and such liberty for conscience as is consistent with the execution of law.

It is a pity that so fine an exposition was not made to the generation for which it was devised; underneath much that was capricious, vacillating, and unprincipled in Elizabeth's character and policy, there lay a real discernment and grasp of principles which elevates her statesmanship to a very high rank; and if the execution was not always equal to the conception, those who misunderstood the policy and those who misrepresented it must take a very large share of the blame. Puritanism and recusancy alike would have had far less misery to undergo if they could have been allowed by their leaders to meet such intentions half-way.

AUTHORITIES.—Strype, *S.P. Spanish*; Parker *Corr.* as before.

The returns to the Privy Council as to Justices are printed in *Camden Misc.* ix. For the Harman case see *Acts of P. Council*, Nov. 1564. See Horne's Register for the Oxford Visitations. For Cambridge, Heywood and Wright, *Cambridge Transactions*, and Cooper, *Athenæ Cantab.* For the diocese of Bangor, *S.P. Dom.* xlv. 27, and later vols. of *S.P.* for the government's action in the North. Cp. *Burghley Papers*, u.s.; Sharpe, *Memorials of the Rebellion*; Collins, *Queen Elizabeth's Defence* (*Ch. Hist. Soc. Tract* lviii.); *Depositions and Eccl. Proceedings* (Surtees Soc.).

The reference to "Papists' Corner" is taken from Norton, *A Warning against the Dangerous Practices of Papists*. For the Lincolnshire ornaments see Peacock, *English Church Furniture*.

For the executions after the northern rebellion see H. B. McCall in *Yorks. Archaeol. Journal*, xviii.

but not
issued.

CHAPTER IX

DEFINING THE *VIA MEDIA*

THE year 1570 begins a new chapter, for it marks the final separation from Rome and the beginnings of formal secession from the English Church. The northern rising was the last bit of spontaneous revolt on the part of the English people against the reformed religion; it failed for lack of support. The pope had subsidised it, and in the Low Countries over the water Alva had watched on behalf of Philip of Spain for a chance of successful intervention. But such support as this could never have carried it through; its only chance of success hung upon the rising of the discontented, and when it came to the point the discontented refused to rise. Much of the refusal may have been due to apathy or to prudence; much, no doubt, was due to real loyalty to Crown and country; and much also, it may be supposed, to the conviction that there were worse possibilities than the mild rule which had so far reigned. The queen disclaimed inner inquisition, but demanded outward conformity. Would any other *régime* then conceivable—Marian, French, Spanish, papal, or even puritan—be willing to go so far in the direction of liberty of conscience?

Hitherto the ecclesiastical rule had been gentle, but the new year marks the turning-point. Eleven years had passed since Elizabeth's accession, and it could hardly be expected that the papacy, seeing the case of its adherents becoming more and more hopeless, could retain much longer its policy of restraint and hopefulness. The new pontiff, Pius V., was not the man to hold his hand;

Causes of the failure of the northern rebellion.

The turning-point, 1570.

his very virtues, and his flaming zeal for righteousness, made that the more impossible. The letter which the earls despatched to him when they took the field did not reach him till February 8. When he replied on February 22, promising a further subsidy, he was still unaware of the collapse of the insurrection; but in his anxiety to strike an effective blow he had already taken steps towards issuing the sentence of excommunication against Elizabeth, which Dr. Morton had prematurely notified to the insurgents.

On February 5, a process had been begun at Rome designed to establish legally certain facts about her, such as these:—that she had usurped the position of head of the English Church, had deprived and imprisoned bishops and clergy and substituted heretics who were not priests in their rooms, had opposed papal authority and made others take an oath opposed to it; further, that she herself lived as an heretic and had not prevented the heinous proceedings of her parliament and people. Witnesses, both clerical and lay, were called to substantiate these charges: twelve exiles appeared, including among the clergy the Marian Bishop of St. Asaph, an abortive bishop of Bangor, the Dean of Hereford, and Dr. Nicholas Morton, lately returned from England; and among the laity, Sir Richard Shelley, who in exile had become prior of the non-existent knights of St. John of Jerusalem in England. The process closed on the 12th, with a sentence declaring the charges proved; it also pronounced the queen to be excommunicate and deposed, and her subjects to be dispensed from their oath, and it assigned to the flames the prayer-book and the oath of supremacy.

The trial of
the queen at
Rome,
February 1570.

On the 25th the pontiff took a higher flight in the bull *Regnans in excelsis*. Claiming as chief over all peoples and all realms the power "to pluck up, to destroy, to scatter, to ruin, to plant, and to build," he proceeded to scatter the hopes and ruin the prospects of his adherents in England by the consistent but impolitic step of publishing the excommunication and deposition of the queen, on the charges, true and untrue, which have been already named. In co-operating thus with the policy of the exiles, he made an intolerable position for those of his followers who remained in England. Thenceforward

The bull of
excommuni-
cation and
deposition.

they had to choose between loyalty to the English Crown and loyalty to the Apostolic See, for the two had been made incompatible. Moreover, by absolving them from oaths, he took away from them their one chance of professing their loyalty to the queen, for the oath of a person who is absolved from his oaths is valueless. The Recusants were thus between the upper and the nether millstone. Romanism, as a form of English separatism, had begun formally to exist and to be almost inevitably identified with treason.

For the moment the thunderbolt hung fire. It was reported to be traversing the Continent, but Spain, France, and Germany were all ill-pleased with the report of it, and Alva, on the Flemish coast, was none too eager to do the pope's bidding and publish it. Published in England, June 1570. The Spanish ambassador, however, was eager: it would cause such a stir in the country and in Ireland as might prove serviceable to the schemes that he had in hand. So a copy was smuggled into England by a Spanish chaplain, delivered to a gentleman named Felton, who was willing to act as cat's-paw, and then figured ingloriously for a few hours on the palace gate of the Bishop of London in St. Paul's Churchyard. However, even such an informal publication as this was amply sufficient; the die was cast, and the first English blood was shed, for Felton, scorning flight, was captured and tried under the ancient common laws of England, by which the publishing by a subject of a bull against the sovereign was treason in the highest degree. He suffered the barbarous penalty of the time, being dragged to Newgate on a hurdle, hanged, cut down, mutilated, disembowelled, and quartered. Thus began a series of horrible sentences to barbarous execution for what the prosecutor called treason and the defendant called religion. There was now no way of distinguishing the two. Felton's case was in this respect the same as all that followed, and though as a rule Roman Catholics have tried to differentiate and say that he suffered for treason but the rest for religion, of late Rome has bowed to the inevitable, has given him a place with the rest on its roll of martyrs, and beatified him.

Thereafter came a lull, broken by nothing more startling than paper war. Replies to the bull came forth in many

forms; Jewel's sermons were serious and solid; Norton's pamphlets were popular and even broad; Bullinger's treatise was weighty; there were ballads that were not poetical and prose efforts that were too heavy to come to the birth, but have lingered in manuscript among the State Papers to testify how great was the excitement and how burning the desire to reply; for the queen, with all her failings, vanities, and sins, was the darling of her people. A few days after the posting up of the bull the Lord Keeper explained in the Star Chamber that such as had been convented before the Council had been charged not for religion but for breach of statute law. He gave a solemn assurance in the queen's name that none should be molested by any inquisition or examination of their consciences in matters of religion, since she would not fail of honourable intention towards all her subjects, and would be loath to alter her natural clemency into a princely severity. It was well meant, but the time was gone by when such good intentions could furnish a way out of the position. The deadlock was inevitable.

A good idea of the state of feeling in the country previous to the publication of the bull may be gained from the replies to the privy council order for the swearing of the justices. The home counties showed much unanimity in professing submission to the Act of Uniformity. Elsewhere two or three refusers and some absentees were reported, and it was noted that the suspected persons were not justices and so were untouched. Bonds were taken of the refusers, and some were sent up to the Council. But the northern counties were too disordered to send returns, and for knowledge of them recourse must be had elsewhere. When Pilkington returned to his diocese of Durham in the summer of 1570, he found many in prison, many absconded, but "the greater number lying in concealment, eagerly expecting an occasion of fresh disturbances."

Archbishop Grindal at his first entry upon his new diocese found the same—the people "much exasperated and panting for renewed disturbances." "The greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to good religion." The old observances were found

Paper war
and mild pro-
nouncements.

The state of
recusant
feeling.

The diocese
of York,

going on among the people, and the change from London was so violent that the bishop felt as though it were another Church. In his visitation of his province and diocese he subsequently found matters improved and the people more complying. The injunctions that he issued were stringent, and he enjoined in some respects more than the law would enforce. He ordered, for example, a reading-desk in which to read divine service, the litany and the epistle and gospel, facing the people. He prescribed a monthly communion, but enforced the daily office only "every Saturday and holy-even." The commination service was to be said three times a year—between litany and communion—as well as on Ash Wednesday. The parish clerk was to read the first lesson and the epistle, but not to marry, baptize, or administer the cup. There is an interest, too, in the observances which he forbade, such as many ringings of bells for superstitious purposes, the keeping of abrogated fasts and festivals, "praying upon" beads and popish primers, burning candles at Candlemas, going to a popish priest for shrift, worshipping or reverencing images or crosses, and many more such things. Further, the monuments of superstition were still in question, and the celebrant of the communion and baptism was restricted to such ceremonies only as were appointed in the prayer-book. These injunctions represent very vividly the struggle which was going on between the older and the newer ways.

When Barnes, lately consecrated suffragan of Nottingham, in the diocese of York, was translated to fill Best's place at

Carlisle, he sent to Cecil a report of the state of
Carlisle,
Chester, and the diocese. He found a better state of affairs
Wales.

than that to which he had been used. In Lancashire, indeed, "the people fall from religion," and in consequence of the bull the great men had given up the English service and openly received the "traitorous priests." But elsewhere such hostile gentry were few; five were reported in Westmoreland, and five in Cumberland, one of whom—a mild papist—was made up for by a *fautor Lovanensium, sanguinarius papista*. Cheshire was reported officially by the laity to have good quietness, and Wales the same. This view was at variance with the complaints that were being made at the Council Board with regard to the bishop and diocese of

Chester, but as to Wales the bishops endorsed the report. In St. David's none refused church or communion, in Llandaff only a few; but there was much superstition and blindness as well as evil living. The Bishop of St. David's submitted a long list of grievances, with proposed remedies. Much of the poverty of the endowments, he reported, is due to the suppression of the religious houses, and superstition brought in offerings which are not now available. Some is due to the lease of livings and the exaction of the lessees, who so underpay the curates that they attempt to serve many churches, with the result that none have a whole service once a year. The lawyers tie the bishops' hands, and the sheriffs paralyse discipline. The Crown must provide augmentation, and a commission is wanted to deal summarily with abuses. The complaint deserves the more notice because a similar wail came from Llandaff and St. Asaph.

In other parts, though there had been less disturbance, there was growing disaffection. The eastern counties had hitherto won notoriety for their puritanism. Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich had been in trouble again and again. Parker had intervened in 1568 with a special metropolitical visitation to compensate for his laxness. The commission had been invoked to try to remedy disorders in the cathedral in the year following, but in the autumn of 1570 matters went so far that four prebendaries were led by their reforming zeal to enter the choir, break down the organ, and commit other outrages. All this went unpunished by the bishop, and the scandal grew till the queen ordered him to send up the case to Parker. In spite of all this puritan temper, however, Norfolk had its reactionary rising; the summer months had witnessed a sharp little demonstration of arms in favour of Mary, popery, and Norfolk, who lay captive in the Tower; and provided a marked little harvest for the hāngman.

Again, in the heart of puritan London there was a stronghold of the enemy among the lawyers. In May 1569 the ecclesiastical commission was busy ministering articles to suspected persons. In the Inner Temple some had indeed attended the Temple Church, but only rarely, and to walk about the roundel there.

The eastern
counties.

The
recusancy
of London
lawyers.

They had, indeed, received communion, but rarely and only when forced; some had kept away from mass since they were convented eight or nine years before; others declined to answer the delicate question or absented themselves. The state of things was much the same at the Middle Temple; and at Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn a whole party of twenty were ejected and debarred from their profession till they were reconciled. Another set was sent to the Fleet prison and further charged with hearing mass, possessing contraband Louvainist books and a lewd libel called *A Knack to know a Knave*, contributing to the support of the exiles, bearing a hand in the northern troubles, and so forth. So there came a lull in the courts of the Temple; but within two years the lawyers were in trouble again. Indeed, it is a significant fact that some of the most eminent lawyers, such as Plowden, were staunch and canny recusants; and even among the judges there were still, as in the early days, some who could not be trusted to convict under the penal laws.

In the southern counties the diocese of Chichester was much in disorder. Some of the Marian clergy clung to their benefices, but refused to preach; and in the dearth of preaching clergy (there were only sixteen in the diocese) this was very grievous. Others had ceased to minister, but ran between Sussex and Hampshire, and hindered true religion. A number of the laity stayed away from church, had private services conducted by strange clergy in their chapels, or disappeared at Easter time so as to avoid communion. They have, it was reported, early copies of the books from abroad, they have not given them up to the bishop, as the proclamation of March 1, 1569, ordered, but on the contrary they are corresponding with and supporting Stapleton and others like him in exile. The schoolmasters are unlicensed in many places, and are unsound as well; the altars are standing, images and ornaments are hidden, but all is ready to set up the mass again in four-and-twenty hours. In Battle, a great centre of Romanism, when a sermon is preached against the pope the people leave the church. There, as in the North, the people kept to their beads, their Latin primers, and their superstitious bell-ringing; indeed, except for Lewes and a little part of Chichester, the whole diocese was reported very

Disorders in
Chichester.

blind and superstitious, and the clergy for the most part very simple.

The archbishop had reduced his own diocese to a more satisfactory state; in 274 parishes of Kent he reported 113 persons to be irregular churchgoers and about the same number to be out of communion, ten of them persons of quality and absentees these ten years; the proportion of communicants to population was seven in every two households, and the number of persons confirmed in the year amounted to nearly 2000. In his 13 London parishes there were few only who did not communicate, and the cause in most cases was puritanism; elsewhere quarrels formed a constant cause of absence from communion, and it is clear that only in a few cases was recusancy the cause. But in spite of all this he was greatly perturbed at the increase of "massing" after the northern rebellion, and was calling for a new ecclesiastical commission to deal with it.

On the other hand, puritanism was growing in definiteness, boldness, and power. The struggle about the habits became inconspicuous as the greater and deeper points at issue came more clearly into view. Simultaneously the leadership of the party passed into new hands: the older leaders, men like Sampson and Humphrey, were the contemporaries and fellow exiles of the bishops, and the Genevan leaven had come only at a late date into them: the younger men had been built up and formed in the Genevan system. Presbyterian ministry, with the discipline of the presbytery, was their first love, and no fellow-feeling for the bishops or kindly toleration for the abuses of episcopal government, which were many, kept them back from pressing for the adoption of the model of foreign reformed churches or from agitating against episcopacy and all its doings. The chief leader of the new campaign was Thomas Cartwright, a scholar of eminence and a divine of piety and high character, an able preacher, and well qualified by his powers, and not least by the narrowness of his enthusiasm, to be for a time at least a leader of an opposition. The opening of the new campaign may be dated from the day when, newly seated in the chair of the Lady Margaret professorship at Cambridge, he made a frontal attack on the episcopal government of the Church.

Better conformity at Canterbury.

Puritanism led by Cartwright.

Complaint was speedily made to Cecil as Chancellor of the University, and there streamed letters from Cambridge to London and back. The greater part of the University took Cartwright's side: many of the leading men did so more out of respect for his learning and character than out of sympathy for his views; but a large section of the younger men were with him heart and soul. At this juncture a new figure appeared upon the scene, small and dark, but destined from this time forward to fill a large space upon the canvas. John Whitgift was Master of Trinity College, Cartwright's senior by some few years only, his equal in zeal and ability, his rival in this contest of ecclesiastical polity and government. He was not without sympathy for the nonconformist position; he had even been charged with nonconformity, and in defending himself to Cecil, who proposed to appoint him to the mastership, he expressed his grief that men should abstain from preaching because of things indifferent. But in Cartwright's utterance he detected revolutionary principles. If all offices were to be abolished in the Church but those mentioned in Scripture, if there was to be equality of ministers, and the offices of bishop and deacon were to be conformed to such an equality, if all ministers were to be chosen by the people, and must have a cure,—there was an end of the episcopate, of diocesan government, and of ordination as currently used: it involved a revolution.

Whitgift therefore came to the front to oppose this movement. Before long as vice-chancellor he was enabled to deal stringently with Cartwright, by ejecting him from his professorship and inhibiting him from the pulpit; and, in order to meet more effectually the full force of the rising, he was procuring in face of great opposition a new set of statutes for the university. The battle was thus arrayed in a new form: the hottest part of it was from this time to centre round episcopacy in both its spiritual and its ecclesiastical sense; and puritanism was to contend for a new view of the ministry, and a new system of ecclesiastical discipline. Apart from the attractiveness of the Genevan polity, there were abuses enough at home to warrant the attack and to rally many followers. There were many upon the bench of bishops who were unworthy of their place there, and

An outbreak at Cambridge, June 1570, brings Whitgift forward in opposition.

The puritan complaints of the episcopate,

the proportion of these did not diminish as Elizabeth's reign went on: but the fault was not wholly theirs. The episcopal government was still directed by its medieval traditions, and, even when prelates were anxious to reform, their legal officials were interested in hindering them. Patronage and the tenure of benefices were degraded, but none loved the degradation better than the laity, who made profit out of it: and a high-minded bishop like Parker was continually at variance even with some of his best friends, because he attempted to prevent simoniacal scandals, refused unworthy nominees for livings, or sought to remedy the starvation of the benefices by the laity who had leased them. Other things less reprehensible were hotly attacked by the new enemy, such as the granting of dispensations and licenses by the Court of Faculties of the Archbishop. Parker was willing to yield much of what had come to be solid perquisites of his see. He did regulate much; he gave few licenses to eat meat on fast days and only on a doctor's testimony, and few licenses to marry without banns or at the prohibited seasons of the year: he was chary of dispensing men from residence on their cures, of allowing pluralities, or of permitting a young student to hold a benefice before his ordination; but his officers and the Crown itself shared the profits with him, and there was more reluctance to reform on their side than on his.

With regard to ecclesiastical discipline, which from this moment becomes one of the chief points at issue, it is clear that there was much ground of complaint. Probably at no previous period was the execution of ecclesi-^{and of}astical discipline so searching: offenders were pre-^{ecclesiastical}sented by their churchwardens, tried in the ecclesiastical courts by archdeacon, bishop, or chancellor, put to penance, or ex-^{discipline.}communicated: but the abuses were many. The system of appeals from the court of archdeacon or bishop to the Arches Court and to the Delegates worked ill, and rich culprits could thus escape: officials were malicious and corrupt, and the commutation of penance for money opened the way to endless scandal. The Puritans found much of this sort to which they could point: and in any case it was not to be expected that they would be in love with a system which dealt stringently with them for their nonconformity, but enabled the lawyers to

let the papists go free. Moreover, statesmen, who were no partisans, could not but recognise the abuse of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and see that, however much there might be which it was out of the power of the bishops to remedy, they were not as a body at all free from blame.

Thus both on the right and on the left the forces were mustering in numbers and strength against the Church: and the rival oppositions, far from weakening one another, added to each other's force. While the horror of popery added to the power of puritanism, the excesses of nonconforming churchmen and the revolutionary character of their new propaganda, decided many timid souls to leave the Church and to throw in their lot with recusancy and the new crusade of the Holy Father against Elizabeth.

Such was the critical condition of affairs when Elizabeth was forced to call a new parliament. However much she might wish to avoid a renewal of parliamentary interference with matters matrimonial and ecclesiastical, the state of the treasury made such a course inevitable. Early in 1571 the writs went out for a parliament to meet in April, and following them there went letters, calling upon those whom the queen felt she could trust to secure in their various localities the return of suitable members—a form of packing which was certainly common, and perhaps was not unfitting the still rudimentary development of representative rule. Recent events had entirely transformed the state of affairs: where formerly there had been two disaffected parties within the Church, there were two now in open hostility—the Romanists without and the presbyterian puritans within. The external foe called for new measures of repression. Much was going on under the surface: the nations of the continent were being stirred to take up the cause of Mary of Scotland as a rival to Elizabeth: the pope's anathema was working secretly in many English hearts, that hitherto would have scorned the thought of disloyalty; there were plots in Ireland fostered by papal envoys and subsidies, and a conspiracy in England, which had Ridolfi, the pope's factor, for its principal agent, Mary's release and succession for its objective, and the Duke of Norfolk for its tremulous

The rival
foes of the
Church.

A new parliament,
April 2—
June 15,
1571.

figure-head. The dangers, on the contrary, that threatened from within called not for legislation but the prevention of legislation; it was certain that the puritan party, after being foiled in the last parliament by high-handed action of the supremacy, would return to its attempts with greater persistency and power.

The parliament began on April 2, and from the first its main interests were ecclesiastical. In the Upper House a large body of the temporal peers were in more or less degree attached to Norfolk, while the solid phalanx of the bishops could be trusted to support the government, now represented by Cecil in the Upper House, under his new title of Lord Burghley. The Lower House was more homogeneous, and puritan sympathies were in the ascendant. From the first the note was struck of danger from the "raging Romanists." In the Commons on April 4 a bill for coming to church and communion began its troublous course; two days later a committee was appointed to discuss ecclesiastical abuses—pluralities, dispensations, the holding of benefices by known papists, and the like. On the same day the whole puritan programme was unfolded, consisting of the six bills which had been strangled at birth in the last parliament (p. 133), with a seventh newly added. Round these much discussion gathered, and happily a detailed account of the earlier speeches has been preserved, which throws upon the proceedings a flood of light as welcome as it is rare. On the 9th the Commons took in hand a *Bill touching certain offences to be made treasons*, and the Lords a *Bill against the bringing in of bulls*; and so the erection of defences against the recusant peril began. Both of these passed, but only after much negotiation and discussion, and many conferences between committees of the two Houses—an expedient much used and for various subjects during the present sessions. There was added also to the statute book from similar motives a law that the goods of those who stayed as fugitives abroad without license should be forfeited to the Crown. These three acts constituted the legislative counterblast to the bull of deposition and excommunication.

The scope of high treason was now greatly enlarged: it included ecclesiastical offences, such as reconciling or being

reconciled to the Roman see, or taking action on the papal bull. Confederates were made liable to a *præmunire*.

Its effects.

The penalties were even extended to material things, hallowed crosses, pictures, and the like, or the papal trinkets called by the name of *Agnus dei*: those who handled such spiritual contraband were also liable to *præmunire*. The effect was retrospective, but an opportunity was given to the adherents of Rome to give up with impunity any bulls or articles in their possession, and on due submission to the bishop of the diocese to be readmitted to the Church of England. It was an official recognition of the breach which the bull had made, and of the distinction which now had come into being between those who remained in the Church of England and those who left it to become Romanists.

The bill to enforce attendance at church and communion was designed to be a means in the hands of the government to distinguish the two bodies. From the time of its first appearance the fear of the queen's intervention in the matter was upon the Commons.

An abortive
bill for
compulsory
worship.

Her secretary wished the bill to be submitted to the bishops' consideration, mindful, no doubt, of the royal message sent to the last parliament; but Fleetwood, the lawyer, was full of precedents to prove the competency of the House, and thought that the bishops would be slow. During its course a protest was twice made by Mr. Aglionby in favour of liberty of conscience. He was willing to compel attendance at church, but regarded compulsory communion as a wrongful forcing of conscience. "The conscience of man," he said, "is eternal, invisible, and not in the power of the greatest monarchy in the world in any limits to be straitened." He went on also to show the inherent absurdity of compelling men, because they are wicked men, to come to such an ordinance, in view of the fact that the penalty of unworthy reception is death and damnation. But all this was far in advance of the times. In reply Strickland, the puritan protagonist, taking the line, which was to become for long the defence customary with his party for its intolerance, quoted Scripture to show how rightly "the consciences of men were by the prophet restrained." Dalton gave the plain man's reply that men's consciences did not concern the

lawmakers; the members should discharge their own consciences by making the bill law, and leave other people's consciences alone. Norton argued from policy merely, that the touchstone by which to try persons suspected of papistry must be the receiving of communion. The House concurred, and noted with approval the order lately sent forth by the privy council and judges ordering the suspected lawyers of the Temple to communicate. The course of the bill in the Lords was more simple. Introduced on May 5, it passed its third reading on the 17th with four dissentients. A week followed spent in negotiation between the two Houses as to details of disagreement, and on May 25 the bill had its final reading. But the Crown had yet to be reckoned with, and evidently the royal assent was refused; for, after all the labour spent upon it, the measure never passed into the statute book.

In other cases the heavy hand of the queen had been felt at earlier stages of the sessions. Before the parliament was ten days old, when her action with regard to some non-ecclesiastical licenses was called into question by a motion, she sent a message to tell the Commons ^{Fresh puritan aggressions suppressed by the Crown,} to spend little time in motions and avoid long speeches. On April 14, Easter Even, Strickland, who from the first had led the campaign of ecclesiastical reform by parliamentary methods, introduced a *Bill for Reformation of the Book of Common Prayer*. When two of the queen's officers spoke words of caution against invading the royal supremacy, others spoke of the gravity of the case, and of the need of alteration in such points as kneeling at communion. Ultimately the House agreed to petition the queen for leave to proceed with the bill. The petition was never made, for Strickland in the Easter recess was summoned before the Council, and kept back for some days after re-assembling from the indignant House, which was only restrained with difficulty from entering into a conflict with the Crown. A similar fate befell one of the seven bills which formed the main planks in the platform of the reforming party. The bill to confirm the articles of religion had passed the House of Commons in the last parliament. It did so again now, as a *Bill for Conservation of Order and Uniformity*,

and had been once read in the Lords, when on May 1 a fresh message from the queen quashed a projected conference between the two Houses on the subject. While expressing her approval of the articles, she said she would not have them dealt with by parliament, but would by her own supremacy have them executed by the bishops.

Various fates awaited the other bills; the sixth never got so far as a reading at all; the third, *For Residence of Pastors*, was rejected at the third reading in the Commons; but some small ecclesiastical measures pass. others reached the Lords, only to stick there; in the end two passed into law—a short act dealing with the leases of benefices, and a long and important *Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion*. Though it did not confirm the Articles as its fellow bill had tried to do, it demanded subscription to them from all Marian priests, from all candidates for Orders, and all incumbents entering on new cures; any who maintained doctrine contrary to them was to be deprived. The bill further checked the dispensations to young students to hold benefices, allowing none with cure of souls to be taken by any one unless he were at least a deacon of twenty-three years; recent action on the part of the archbishop had already greatly diminished the evil, but even in the present reign benefices had been held by boys of fourteen. So ended the effective business of this important parliament: many measures were left unfinished both of attack and of defence: for example, one against disguised popish priests, and others to reform church patronage, and the procedure with criminous clerks.

Meanwhile, besides the conferences which the bishops had held with the Commons, they had been very busy in convocation. Subscription to the Articles, still Convocation deals with Bishop Cheyney, enforceable as yet only by ecclesiastical authority, was required of those members who had not signed hitherto (April 7), on pain of exclusion from the House; and, perhaps in significant proximity with this, steps were taken to deal with Cheyney, Bishop of Gloucester, who was not at all in favour with his brother bishops. His "Lutheran" leanings in sacramental doctrine were disliked, he was too conscientious to please those who differed from him, and too honest to be silent. In particular, his ridicule

of the doctrines and dissensions of foreign protestants in a course of sermons at Bristol, and his repudiation of Calvinistic views of freewill, had caused great dissatisfaction there. As, however, the officials of the city complained equally of his appeal to catholic consent and the ancient Fathers, they cannot have been very good judges of his tenets. He was a far better man and sounder churchman than many, but tactless; and so he proved himself now. As he had objected to the signing of the Articles in 1563, so it was supposed that his absence from this convocation was due to the same reluctance. In particular he had disliked the statement introduced into Article xxviii., that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten after an heavenly and spiritual manner *only*, though Guest explained to him that the phrase was meant to safeguard, not to deny, the real Presence. He was now excommunicated for absenting himself, and cited to answer some charges of error; whereupon he pleaded sickness, and was absolved; but the charge of the vacant diocese of Bristol was taken out of his hands.

On May 4, the day after the bill for clerical subscription had passed the Commons, convocation was discussing the revision of the Articles; ultimately it made a number of changes of minor importance, together with two that need special mention. In 1563, at ^{and the Articles of Religion.} the last moment before publication, the new Article about eucharistic doctrine (xxix.) had been withdrawn, and a clause had been prefixed, probably by royal authority, to Article xx. The synod now accepted the new clause, but restored the missing Article, and thus the book came out in its permanent shape, containing the familiar xxxix Articles, with the expressed approval of Crown and convocation. It is interesting to observe that while convocation and parliament were both dealing with the subject, there was no concerted action between them. The code imposed by parliament was that of 1563; and while parliament was imposing it, convocation was quite independently modifying it. Further, it is the modified code which in practice has ever since been subscribed, and not the code ordered by parliament; indeed, it is quite possible that the parliamentary bill was tolerated, and ultimately assented to by the queen,

only because she was meanwhile making such an arrangement herself with convocation as would supersede in part the action of parliament. She was quite able to appreciate the humour of such a situation, and to enjoy such a means of getting her own way at parliament's expense.

The discussion of the final form of the Articles evoked a clerical protest, to balance the lay protest already recorded, against forcing recusants to receive the holy sacrament. Guest's protest against compulsion to communion. Bishop Guest wrote to Burghley after the book of Articles had been submitted to the queen, suggesting various further amendments, including the omission of the word "only" at which Bishop Cheyney stumbled: these proposals were ineffective, but at the end of the letter came the protest in question. The bishop drew the same distinction as the layman: to drive papists to church is both lawful and necessary, but "to enforce them to receive" he thinks utterly unlawful; they judge it, he argues, to be no communion or no lawful communion, because they think that we have no consecration, having no manual acts attached to the words; and therefore we ought not to give it them, because they can, in such a case, only receive it to their condemnation. The theologian's protest is a welcome ally to that of the politician; but both together could not do more than stave off for a time the horrible policy of forcing men to receive communion by act of parliament as a political test.

The exact history of this revision of the Articles cannot be made out satisfactorily owing to the lack of proper records of this convocation; but a far greater obscurity surrounds the other important document which now emanated from the same source, viz. the *Book of Discipline* or Canons of 1571. The Reformatio Legum, The proposals on the subject at the previous convocation reappeared, for the parliamentary act for clerical subscription included at least one, and others came up afresh before convocation, and passed into the new *Book of Discipline*. At one time the idea was entertained of bringing to completion the code of canon law which had been begun in Henry's time, and actually drafted at the end of Edward's reign. A bill to authorise the continuance of the work was introduced into Elizabeth's first parliament; it passed the Commons, but made no way in the Upper House.

The project then was taken up by the archbishop: the draft was amended and completed under Parker's direction; and it was actually published for him by John Foxe, the Martyrologist, in April 1571, under the title of *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. At the beginning of this parliament, Strickland had called for the production of the book in the Commons, and it was actually produced by Norton. But it was not a code to command the support of the puritan party, though there were details in it, especially as regards discipline, which might have evoked its sympathy. It preserved the whole of the ancient organisation of ecclesiastical authority. The episcopacy, the system of patronage, the archidiaconal courts, the hierarchy of orders—these things, and many more like them, could hardly be acceptable to the puritan mind, however much they might be reformed. Nor was the code well looked on by more conservative churchmen. Even if they were not already inclined to mistrust puritan proposals, they could hardly fail to be suspicious, when they found that both Foxe in his preface and Strickland in his speech combined the recommendation of this code with depravation of the prayer-book. It is not very clear how much Parker had really taken up the project: he certainly was interested in the work, and introduced some few changes into it; especially, he cut out a phrase in the dogmatic part of the document which dealt with justification by faith, and he introduced words into a later clause designed to prevent it from being quoted as an obstacle to the carrying of the sacrament to the sick on the same day on which it was consecrated (p. 79). But the project came to an end: the little book itself was so rare that in 1590, when Penry wished for a copy, in the hope that it might support his agitation against the authorities of the Church, he could not find one. It remained little known until similar motives brought about reprints in 1640 and 1641.

The canons which actually were passed by convocation were of quite a different character. The *Reformatio Legum* had been intended to supersede the existing canon law and form the starting-point of a new system. The famous *Act of the Submission of the Clergy* in 1533 had continued all such canons as were not contrariant to the royal prerogative and the laws, statutes, and customs of

and the
Canons of
1571.

the realm, only until such time as a new code was drawn and made effective by obtaining the royal assent: the *Reformatio Legum* aspired to be that code. So long as none was authorised the ancient canons still remained, but on a very dubious foundation. When the project of a new code was given up, this dubious foundation became permanent. The new canons were built upon it, and all subsequent canonical legislation of the English Church has followed this precedent down to the present day. They were not unworthy to head a fresh series of post-reformation enactments. When they were presented to the queen she approved and amended them, but she refused to them the royal assent which was necessary to give them statutory force; they were, however, acted upon in church government by right of their ecclesiastical authorisation, and became an effective part of the ecclesiastical system independently of the civil sanction. This was probably the result which the queen intended, for she was continually urging the bishops to stand upon their own legs, when they were timidly inclined to lean upon the support either of parliament or of the Crown. Even when Parker's courage was screwed up to the point of action, Grindal's was apt to fail. And indeed it was perhaps not surprising that bishops should tremble. The recovery of episcopal authority from the laxity and corruption into which it had lapsed in the days when bishoprics were the reward of successful diplomacy or skilful statesmanship was not to be accomplished with ease, especially in the face of a growing presbyterian opposition. Much of the law here laid down had to depend solely upon the action of the bishops until it was incorporated into later canons that received civil sanction, especially those of 1604; and it was no small part of the aggravation of the puritan bitterness against the bishops that they were acting *jure episcopali*, without having the authority of parliament behind them—sometimes even in antagonism to its temper, and without having anything more from the Crown than a tacit and concealed approval.

The collection is in ten sections. The duty of bishops was first described, then that of other clergy, of legal officials and churchwardens, of schoolmasters and patrons; special attention was devoted to patronage, residence, pluralities, and preaching. Preachers were instructed to

Their scope.

"teach nothing but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New, and that which the catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have gathered out of that doctrine." Subscription was demanded not only of the clergy, but also of all lay ecclesiastical chancellors, commissaries, and officials; much restriction was put upon their action, and particularly all sentences of excommunication and commutations of penance for a money penalty were taken out of their hands and confined to the bishop himself. The abuses, however, still went on, and continued to vex both parliament and convocation. The new translation of the Bible, which the bishops had recently completed, and Nowell's Larger Catechism, which, after long delay, had been issued in 1570, figured here; while the *Advertisements* acquired a growing status by being mentioned three times over, and once in company with the royal injunctions and such visitation injunctions as bishops may from time to time set forth.

A great attempt was made to encourage good learning: the non-graduate clergy were set definite biblical tasks to learn, and were examined at the visitations; the laity were set the Catechism to learn as a necessary preliminary to communion, sponsorship, or marriage. The standard of requirements for the ministry was raised, and the temporary expedient of supplying the place of clergy by readers began to come to an end; at a later stage they became discredited in the eyes of ecclesiastical authority because they made it more easy for the puritan preacher to escape reading the services of the prayer-book and to confine himself to the sermon: thereupon they disappeared from history, and their name became adopted as a term of reproach for non-preaching ministers.

Another and more ancient institution was at the same time abolished. This was the vestment called the almuce, a fur tippet which, under the sanction no doubt of the ornaments' rubric, was still being worn by clergy in high positions. This innocent garment had for some time been attacked by the Puritans as one of the "gross points of popery," and, in deference to their view that it was defiled with superstition, it was at this time given up. If any one thought that such a surrender would pacify the enemy he was greatly mistaken: Cartwright was delighted

The folly
of making
concessions
to puritan
leaders.

with this sign of yielding, and at once went on to ask why "copes, caps, surplices, tippetts, and such like baggage" were to be exempted from the same condemnation. It is of no use to make concessions to a declared revolutionary; they only whet his appetite for more. Such were the extreme men of the puritan party who were now assuming the reins of leadership, and Parker came to see the folly of attempting concessions.

It would, however, be entirely misleading to judge of puritanism by its extreme men. The best of the composite body comprehended under that term were not spoiled by the factiousness, violence, or bitterness which marred even the great qualities and abilities of a leader such as Cartwright; if it had been so the term puritan would have been a misnomer. The men who were most deservedly though derisively called by that nickname were high-souled men of piety, who had the fear of God and a pure ideal before their eyes in days when looseness and recklessness were only too common. They had seen the old corruptions; they had seen the new irreligion which came in by a natural reaction. Their soul abhorred both, and longed for that ideal Christian society which, in spite of our Lord's discouragement of any such hope, many men of very various mould have from time to time hoped to find or found here on earth.

The best of them were men who could exalt the ministry of preaching without depreciating the ministry of sacraments or the orderliness of fixed worship. *The Orders and Dealings in the Church of Northampton*, drawn up on June 5, 1571, describe in some detail the devotional system which the moderate men had set before them, and for which they secured the approval of their bishop. The services of the prayer-book were used, but the office was transferred from the choir to the body of the church. There was a sermon preached in some church in the town every Sunday and Holy day, preceded and followed by metrical psalms sung by the people. Morning prayer was ended in each church by nine in the morning, and the people then resorted to that church where the sermon was to be preached, according to the method advocated in the *Reformatio Legum*. Besides

The better
quality of
the obscurer
men.

The North-
ampton
model,
June 5,
1571.

sermons a Scripture lecture was given every Tuesday and Thursday between nine and ten in the morning, and catechising took place after evening prayer on every Sunday and Holy day ; but the catechism was that of Calvin, not that of the Book of Common Prayer. Quarterly communions were held in every church, and during the previous fortnight the minister and churchwardens went from house to house to take the names of intending communicants and to examine their lives before admitting them to communion. Every parish had two communions, each with an hour's sermon ; the first was timed to begin at five and to end at eight, the second to begin at nine and to end at twelve. The Holy table stood in the body of the church, having three ministers, one in the middle to deliver the bread and the other two at either end for the cup : the communicants no doubt filed or "ambled" past without kneeling. During the communion a minister in the pulpit read comfortable scriptures, and at the close a psalm was sung. After the communion the minister made another circuit to discover those who had not communicated ; their names were reported to the mayor and gentry, who with the ministry formed a tribunal of discipline, and sat on every Thursday morning after the lecture to deal with the shortcomings of the flock.

Nor were the ministers uncared for in this remarkable system. We meet here the beginnings of those meetings for biblical study, conference, and prayer which later acquired, somewhat undeservedly, an evil reputation under the name of "prophesyings." The exercises were carefully planned and strictly ordered : they began at nine o'clock every Saturday and continued for two hours ; three quarters of an hour were allotted to the opening exposition of the chosen text of Scripture, subsequent speakers were restricted to a quarter of an hour, and at the close one of the moderators summed up. The president and learned brethren subsequently met and reviewed the exercise, answering any questions that were sent in to them in writing, or correcting any of the speakers. The ministers who took part bound themselves together by signing a special confession of faith. This repudiated the pope as Antichrist, condemned all "manners and fashions to serve God which men have brought in without the authority of the Bible," and among them free-

The
beginnings
of pro-
phesyings.

will, distinction of meats, apparel, and days, and the "order of papistry which they call the hierarchy"; it accepted, however, the Apostles' creed as a summary of the pure word of God and of the doctrine which they set before themselves.

Such a picture represents far more fairly than ecclesiastical conflicts or controversial writings the real position of the best part of the Puritans. It comprises many features worthy of admiration mixed up with much that was dangerously out of harmony with the system of the Church to which the ministers and people equally belonged. The full document shows also two failings of this party, which, though apparently small, were really important: they lacked a sense of proportion and a saving grace of humour. If they had had these they might have been kept from petty conflicts about matters which were unimportant, and which could only have become matters of conscience when conscience was seriously ill-trained; and they might also have brought their fellow-countrymen to repentance by their seriousness, instead of to mockery by their sourness and stupidity.

The better
side of
puritanism.

AUTHORITIES.—See Laderchi, *Annales*, for the process at Rome. Originals of the Star Chamber Declaration of June 25, 1570, not hitherto identified are in *S.P. Dom.* lxxi. 16, 17. See as before *Zurich Letters*, Parker MSS. at Cambridge and *S.P. Dom.*, especially for the diocesan reports; Grindal's *Remains* (Parker Soc.). For Parker's rule see his Register and also *S.P.D.* lx. 71; lxxvi., lxxvii. 66, and *Parker Correspondence*, No. cclxx. Whitgift's opinions must be sought in his *Works* (Parker Soc.). For Cartwright see *Life* by Brook, and *Dictionary of Nat. Biog.* For the Eccl. Courts see *S.P. Dom.* lxvi. 46, and for dispensations see *S.P. Dom.* lxxvii. 66. For Cheyney, see *S.P. Dom.* xlvi. 11-12. For the Articles, Hardwick, *u.s.*; Gibson, *The Articles*; E. T. Green, *The XXXIX Articles*; and for Guest's letter, *S.P. Dom.* lxxviii. 37. For the Canons of 1571, Ch. Hist. Soc. Tract xl. The *Reformatio Legum* was reprinted by Cardwell in 1850. The Northampton model is in Strype, *Ann.*, and *S.P. Dom.* lxxiii. 38; cp. Serjeantson, *Hist. of the Church of All Saints, Northampton*.

CHAPTER X

THE END OF PARKER'S TASK

THE recent convocation had seen evident signs of Parker's failing strength, and yet for four years longer he persevered bravely with his heavy task and in face of scarcely lessened difficulties. In London he now had a ^{Parker's difficulties.} more vigorous supporter. Sandys, who had been taken from Worcester to succeed Grindal, began vigorously by summoning all his clergy at the beginning of 1571 and laying six injunctions upon them as to conformity, apparel, preaching, and similar points of contention; but he was disinclined to proceed to extremities. The late parliament had left things in a very unsettled state: even the question of the Articles led to hot words in the conference between the bishops and the committee of the Commons. For the moment the Puritans were baffled; but for that very reason they were in a state of high indignation with the queen and the bishops, and were looking forward to better success at the next parliament. The year that intervened before then was a time of much anxiety and stress.

Before the new canons appeared on June 7, an order of the commissioners was sent to all churchwardens to see that no minister officiated unlicensed, or otherwise than according to the prayer-book; and that all ^{The battle about clerical subscription, June 1571.} preachers had a new license dated since the May 1 preceding. At the same time the archbishop was dealing with a number of prominent puritan ministers as to their subscription to the three points which now became the test of obedience, viz. the prayer-book, the apparel, and the

Articles of Religion. This task continued through the summer months. The archbishop bore the brunt of the conflict himself, assisted first by the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, and later at the queen's special command by those of London and Sarum.

One of the first cases taken in hand was that of Robert Johnson, who, besides holding various prebends, was chaplain to Lord-Keeper Bacon: he refused to subscribe, and was suspended. Six weeks later he wrote a submission, explaining that he was dissatisfied with the prayer-book because it seemed to countenance baptism by women, and with the habits because they were not expedient or edifying. Apparently as the result of this letter he was restored to ministry. After an interval of two years he was again in trouble, this time with the Bishop of Lincoln: in the interval he had discovered a number of new grievances in the prayer-book and in church government, and he refused to undertake not to speak against them. A second time he seems to have been treated with great leniency and allowed to go on with his ministry. But in a month or two more serious charges landed him in prison: he had omitted the ring at marriage and the cross at baptism; and besides, he had administered unconsecrated wine for the sacrament when the consecrated wine was all consumed. After writing an arrogant rebuke, after the manner of his kind, to the Bishop of London, calling him "Superintendent of popish corruptions in the diocese of London," he made his appearance before him and other commissioners. He admitted the general truth of the facts alleged, but justified his action with regard to the sacrament by pleading that there was no rubric (as was indeed then the case) to order a second consecration. When the bishop argued that he had mocked the people, because there was no sacrament, he tried to belittle the meaning of consecration; thereupon a long argument ensued, which at last the lord chief-justice cut short. After the evidence had been given, the jury convicted him, and Johnson was sentenced to a year's imprisonment for the misdemeanour about the communion. Being in high favour with great persons at the Court, much interest was made to have him again restored; the Council sent to the bishop to have him released because

The cases of
Robert
Johnson

of illness, but in spite of all he died in prison. His case was in some ways very representative, though more conspicuous and more tragic than most.

The bishops continually met obstinacy with leniency, as a further example will show. William Axton was a thoroughgoing puritan, who regarded his own acceptance as a minister by the presbytery as of more importance than his subsequent ordination by the bishop, and had taken care to be called by free election of the people to his cure rather than be appointed by the patron. He was charged before the Bishop of Lichfield in 1570 with the same irregularity as to cross and ring, and with refusing the apparel as well. The bishop offered to drop the question of the cross if he would agree sometimes to wear the surplice. He refused and was deprived. A lengthy report of his interview is preserved, which gives a vivid picture of episcopal patience and puritan obstinacy, drawn by the hand of a puritan. Axton was one of the first to find refuge abroad.

and of
William
Axton.

Meanwhile Grindal in the northern province was set at higher game. The Dean of Durham, William Whittingham, had held a high position among the exiles, for he had been greatly concerned in the production of the Genevan Bible and in the completion of the metrical psalter of Sternhold and Hopkins. He had served the queen with the army in France as diplomatist and divine, and was rewarded with the deanery in 1563. His conduct of services abroad had come in for strong condemnation from Cecil because of its divergence from the English order; and at Durham in the stress of 1566 the same complaints had been renewed about him. He admitted that he came into choir in a round cap and gown without a surplice, and that on his first Christmas Day he had "ministered" the communion without either cope or surplice. After a six-months' struggle he had submitted and conformed; but his conformity was only temporary, and in 1571 his metropolitan sent for him, no doubt as affording a good case with which he might impress the province. Apparently he again conformed, and seven years' of peace followed before the final and most crucial struggle as to his position broke out.

The early
dealings with
Dean
Whittingham.

These are typical instances of the handling of the suspected in the summer of 1571. The rumour of the new developments evoked fresh documents from the foreign doctors, notably from Zanchius of Heidelberg, who, in misapprehension of the real state of the case, was eager to get an expostulatory letter from himself presented to the queen. Grindal prevented this, and wrote to him a very optimistic and in some parts misleading justification of the episcopal position, and a convenient note of some of the stock puritan grievances. In few things were the Puritans more persistent than in complaining of the number of Marianes who were allowed to retain their benefices, while godly ministers were kept out or thrust out. It was this that had led to the passing of the act for subscription to the Articles; and now, if the allegation as to crypto-papists was true, a number of such clergy ought to have been revealed and deprived. This does not, however, seem to have been the case. In the London diocese, for example, the registers give plenty of evidence of deprivations following the proceedings in 1566; but throughout the whole area covered by the modern diocese of London, in about 170 benefices there are only three deprivations recorded in the period from 1571 to 1574; in the county of Essex and in about 370 benefices twelve deprivations are noted which seem to be due to the earlier vestiarian troubles, but only one is recorded in 1571; while four institutions that are dated in 1576-1578 may conceivably be the result of the proceedings subsequent to this act. The explanation may be that the diocese was free from papistical clergy, or else that the execution of the act was very faulty. Other dioceses tell the same tale, and probably both explanations are admissible: the number of unreconciled Marian clergy was small, and even Parkhurst was lenient to them. In any case, the allegation of the Puritans was unjustified.

Equally untrue was their complaint that the ministers of their own colour were ejected in large numbers in consequence of the call for subscription. Among the historians of the puritan cause, Neal complains that a hundred clergymen were deprived in 1572 for refusing to subscribe. Brook speaks of the Church

Puritan
grievances
take new
shape.

The new
subscription
claims but
few victims
in fact.

being deprived of nearly all its faithful pastors, especially in the Midlands and eastern counties; while thousands of ministers of inferior character, such as common swearers, drunkards, gamesters, whoremongers, and massing priests, enjoyed their livings. He is no doubt repeating what was said by the Puritans at the time. But truthfulness never was the Puritans' strong point. The fact, however, seems to be that some of the leaders were taken in hand and the rest left untouched as yet. Of those convented some proved amenable, as Goodman, who, on being charged with his unfortunate book, issued in 1558, against government by women, signed a recantation and a protestation of loyalty to the queen. Others like Wiburn were willing to go a long way towards meeting the requirements, but could not cease to complain of the prayer-book and the habits. Some clearly were allowed to retain their positions unmolested. Even Anthony Gilby, who had distinguished himself by writing against conformity in the earlier crisis of 1566, and had more recently issued another polemical work, seems to have remained undisturbed. In his *View of Antichrist, his laws and ceremonies in our English Church unreformed*, he now displayed a somewhat bitter humour, drawing out fourteen parallels between the Pope of Rome and the Pope of Lambeth, and tabulating *An hundred points of popery remaining which deform the English reformation*. But either the protection of a powerful patron saved him, or else his position in Leicestershire far away alike from London and York; at any rate, he continued to hold the vicarage of Ashby-de-la-Zouch till 1583.

It is reasonable to conjecture that both parties foresaw that they were merely having a short breathing space. Parliament would soon meet again, and the Puritans pinned all their hopes on parliament. As the day drew near for its meeting their expectations rose. The bishops, they thought, will not be able again to thwart us. And Parker's heart sank as he looked forward: the queen was suspicious of his intentions, and the Puritans confidently hostile.

When parliament met it was a time of great excitement, not only because of the conflict that lay ahead, but also

Renewal of
the struggle
in parliament,
May 8 to
June 30, 1572.

because a crisis of quite a different kind had come. Though the northern rebellion had collapsed so feebly, agitation had gone on briskly ever since in the hidden walks of diplomacy. The Duke of Norfolk had been released, but kept under surveillance; he had not been allowed to attend the recent parliament, but his protestations and his external though questionable adherence to the Church kept him his freedom. The new prospect of a match between the queen and the French prince, the Duke of Anjou, had seemed more genuine than other such prospects had been. In consequence, France was friendly to England; the Queen of Scots and her claims receded into the second place in importance in French eyes; and the Spanish mind, represented by Philip in Spain and Alva in the Spanish provinces of the Netherlands, was proportionately set against Elizabeth. The pope was bitterly disappointed at the inefficacy of his bull: continental sovereigns neglected it, or, as in the case of France, slighted it, while it is probable that England generally had hardly heard of it, or heard of it only by the answers put forth to it.

Here, then, were all the materials ready for a further plotting; and during the last parliament Burghley's masterly system of spies had been unravelling an extensive scheme in which the Bishop of Ross, as Mary's ambassador, and Ridolfi, as the pope's agent, had been conspiring busily with Norfolk at home and with Philip and Alva across the seas. It was better worth Burghley's while to keep in touch with the progress of plots than to suppress them; so Ridolfi went his way unmolested to Rome and to Spain, and assisted at a council there wherein it was proposed to send a man to assassinate the queen in the autumn, and so open the way for a rising in England, an invasion from Spain, and the introduction of Mary and Romanism. But in September the disclosure had come: Norfolk had again been sent to the Tower; by dint of spies and torture the whole extent of the machinations had been laid bare; one after another of the persons implicated had been exposed, till finally the bishop and his captive mistress were forced beyond the point where bluster or lying could avail them. The Spanish ambassador, when his turn came, had received notice to leave

It meets in
an electrical
atmosphere,

accumulating
ever since the
Ridolfi plot
of 1571.

the kingdom. As a coping-stone to his three years of plotting he planned the murder of Burghley, and hung about in England till January 1572, hoping to hear that it was accomplished. He heard instead that all, including his own part, was discovered; and he left the country, conscious that all was now over, that Norfolk's trial would soon lead to his execution, and that Mary's chances of life were not much better than those of the English noble with whom she had once thought to share her throne.

Norfolk was speedily condemned by his peers, but the queen, to her people's great disappointment, delayed the execution. Equally little did she satisfy what the nation felt to be needed with regard to the Queen of Scots. So when parliament met there was not only eagerness for the renewal of the ecclesiastical battle, but also a clamorous desire to visit upon both the noble and the captive queen that reward of their crimes which seemed overdue. The latter question was speedily moved. The two Houses conferred and negotiated; and when the queen still opposed the passing of a bill of attainder against Mary, even the gentle Parker wrote in excited protest to Burghley, and the bishops as a body presented a document to the queen to urge her assent to the execution of justice upon her rival. Elizabeth was a woman after all, and a woman with a strange mixture both of caprice and of tenderness in her hard character. She had reached a point where no minister or parliament could force her hand: she refused to countenance extreme measures against her cousin, and, indeed, it was only with great difficulty that her consent was finally secured to the execution of the sentence against the Duke of Norfolk on June 2, 1572.

The queen's
treatment of
Norfolk and
Mary, 1572.

In the matter of church difficulties she was as unyielding as ever: the reforming section in the Commons might meet expectantly and proceed valiantly with a *Bill for Rites and Ceremonies* to supersede the prayer-book, and the House might agree to accept some modification of it, securing a general uniformity without tying ministers to a prescript form; but again the guillotine descended on it. On May 22 the Speaker brought the unwelcome order from the queen that henceforward no bills

and her
restraint of
parliamentary
interference
with religion.

concerning religion were to be received into the Commons, unless they had first been considered and liked by the clergy. At her request the two recent bills were sent to her, and they were accompanied by an apologetic assurance from the House. The treasurer returned answer on the next day that the queen utterly disliked one of the bills, and was determined not to allow the molestation of the clergy which it purported; but she would herself, as Defender of the Faith, discourage all papists and maintain all good protestants.

Parliament thus was barren of new ecclesiastical legislation, and the meetings of convocation were similarly unproductive.

However, a short time before June 30, when it was adjourned, an occurrence took place which was more productive of results than many an act of parliament. A puritan manifesto was published under the title of *An Admonition to the Parliament*, which at once had an enormous effect. Appearing anonymously, and from no press which even the strictest search could discover, and projected into an atmosphere already explosive, it did a work for the puritan cause which hitherto would have been inconceivable. It was read everywhere, and welcomed in spite of all attempts to suppress it. A large part of its success was due, not merely to circumstances, but to its merits, for it had many of the most telling qualities of a successful pamphlet. The first half described the true platform of a church reformed, and contrasted it with the existing state of "our English Church."

The usual complaints against church order and worship were effectively advanced, and summed up in a demand for changes of a radical sort in the ministry, sacraments, and discipline. "Your wisdoms have to remove advowsons, patronages, impropriations, and bishops' authority claiming themselves thereby right to ordain ministers; and to bring in that old and true election which was accustomed to be made by the congregation. You must displace those ignorant and unable ministers already placed . . . utterly overthrow the Court of Faculties . . . appoint to every congregation a learned and diligent preacher; remove homilies, articles, injunctions, and that prescript order of service made out of the mass-book; take away the lordship, the

loitering, the pomp, the idleness and livings of bishops . . . Take away private communions and baptisms . . . enjoin deacons and midwives not to meddle in ministers' matters . . . join assistance of elders and other officers. . . .” Secure “that the statute against wafer-cakes may prevail more than an injunction; that people be appointed to receive the sacrament rather sitting . . . than kneeling; . . . that excommunication be restored to his old former force; that papists nor other neither constrainedly nor customably communicate in the mysteries of salvation; that both the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and Baptism also may be ministered according to the ancient purity and simplicity; . . . and finally, that nothing be done in this or any other thing but that which you have the express warrant of word of God for.”

These and similar demands, though revolutionary, show the soberer side of the *Admonition*; no doubt the passages that made its fame were spicier ones, where, for example, the archbishop's court was called “the filthy ^{and its literary style.} quave-mire and poisoned splash of all the abominations that do infect the whole realm,” or the commissary's court “a petty little stinking ditch that floweth out of that former greater puddle”; or the prayer-book “an unperfect book, culled and picked out of the popish dunghill, the Portuise and mass-book.” These are some flowers of language culled from the second part of the *Admonition*, entitled, *A view of popish abuses yet remaining in the English Church*, which stated the reasons for refusing subscription to the three points which had been put forward since 1571.

The anonymous character of the publication was not long maintained. It was never actually presented to parliament; but two London clergy named Field and Wilcox were sent to prison as the authors of it on July 7, and in Newgate they admitted that they had written the pamphlet “in time of parliament.” Field had already taken part in a movement which has since become famous, for he was among those who met this year at Wandsworth and drew up a definite presbyterian organisation, not as a rival to the Church, for Field was no sectarian, but as an instalment of that polity to which he hoped to bring the whole Church. It

Its authors
are sent to
prison;

was the beginning of a movement from which came many consequences.

Outside the prison the *Admonition* was the talk of the day; the bishops inveighed against it, though the more liberal ones, like Cooper, the new Bishop of Lincoln, who opened the attack at Paul's Cross on June 27, admitted that some of the complaints were justified. The people read it; and when the first edition was exhausted, before the end of August a second, "with additions," followed: this probably included two of the letters written from abroad in 1566, on the vestiarian question, which it now seemed politic to reprint, and also the *Second Admonition to the Parliament*, in which the famous Thomas Cartwright came to the support of his imprisoned comrades. They had written summarily to show the need of further change; he wrote at greater length in order to show the method. Nor did the issue of pamphlets end here: in October further editions contained two new pieces. *An exhortation to the bishops to deal brotherly with their brethren* complained of the cruelty and injustice of the imprisonment of the confessors. If it was admitted that there were abuses, why, it was asked, should men be punished when they had argued against them from God's word? Why should the godly be punished, while papists were condoned? Why should a serious work be suppressed, when lewd ballads went about unchecked? *An exhortation to the bishops and their clergie to answer a little book, etc.* was a more craftily worded pamphlet; for it assumed an impartial air. The two prisoners, it said, deserve all that they have got, and more, if their contentions are wrong: but if so, why is this not demonstrated by the bishops for the guidance of the plain man? Let the bishops disprove the contentions, then they may well repudiate the book and its authors. But if these are not disproved, let the authors and their friends press irresistibly for redress.

The confessors meanwhile, after passing two months of imprisonment uncondemned, sent a petition by the hands of their wives to the archbishop, which brought down in reply a visit from his chaplain and a fruitless disputation. At the beginning of October they

and they are
punished,
Oct. 1572.

were condemned by the lord mayor and aldermen to a year's imprisonment for breach of the Act of Uniformity. After this period they with some difficulty recovered their liberty and went forth to resume a chequered life of ministry, nonconformity, suspension, and deprivation.

The bishops needed no exhortation to induce them to answer. The first success of the libel was so overwhelming, and the attempts to suppress it so futile, that at their earliest leisure a champion was sought, and found in Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Cartwright's old opponent there. The autumn passed in much excitement; the Puritans grew more eager than ever, and when the news came that St. Bartholomew's Day (August 24, 1572) had drenched France in protestant blood, the atmosphere grew hotter; both papists and puritans increased in number and boldness at an alarming pace. Whitgift's efforts were revised by the bishops and other learned men, and in February 1573 there appeared the *Answer to the Admonition*. Beginning with a brief examination of the general line of reasoning in the *Admonition*, Whitgift classified five kinds of fallacy employed, and worked out a list of points in which puritans were dangerously like anabaptists, Donatists, and papists. Then taking the *Admonition* bit by bit, he wrote his reply paragraph by paragraph, after the manner of the time, though he claimed that, his brief examination being duly considered, the book itself needed no other kind of confutation. The two points which he chiefly attacked were the equality of ministers and the sufficiency of Scripture as a directory of ecclesiastical polity. At the end he dealt with the additions, detractions, and alterations which were made in the later editions of the *Admonition*; to the two letters of 1566 there appended he replied by printing two recently received from Gualter and Bullinger; a few pages were devoted to the *Second Admonition*, the two pamphlets above named, and a third called *A reproof of certain articles collected, it is thought, by the Bishops out of "An Admonition,"* etc., which had been also appended in the later copies. The whole field was thus covered.

Whitgift was well aware of the wrath that he would draw

down upon himself, and within a few months his book was answered by Cartwright in *A Reply to the Answer*. Here a new method was adopted: the lines of the *Admonition*, however effective in a pamphlet, were not suited to voluminous controversy such as was in progress; the subject-matter was therefore rearranged, and the discussion fell mainly into four-and-twenty large tractates. The chief points remained as before; much ink was spent on the authority of the Church to prescribe things indifferent and not ordered by Scripture, as also upon the Christian hierarchy, the election and vocation of ministers, and the services of the prayer-book, while a disproportionate place was given to the well-worn theme of the habits. The battle was thus scientifically set in array. These writings became the text books of the controversy, much was added in bulk and volume, but the puritan controversy did not really advance an inch beyond the point reached here, except when, twenty years later, Hooker's genius and piety raised it for a moment on to a higher plane.

No volume of controversy could undo what the *Admonition* had done. There was quite enough of truth in it to carry the attack home and to make Field and Wilcox heroes, to whose prison men streamed as though on a pilgrimage. The lines of necessary reform which Burghley jotted down at this moment form an interesting subject of comparison with the demands of the *Admonition*. More uniformity, reverence, and devotion, more church-going and better keeping of Sunday, a review of dispensations and pluralities, of the leasing and wasting of benefices, restoration of decayed churches—these form the subjects of one paper. A later one adds to this list of needs the lack of clergy and the negligence of teaching. But though it was agreed that reforms were needed, it was first necessary that the disorder should be reduced. A cry arose from the Puritans for a public disputation; the bishops were willing enough, but the government was unwilling: these questions could not safely be considered to be open for discussion: the bishops must first do their best to restore order. So they were kept to their weary task, convening ministers, pursuing the elusive printing-press, which

Progress of the controversy.

Attempts at suppression.

was causing the mischief, and meanwhile being ill spoken of everywhere as persecutors. As time went on the Council was obliged to come more to their assistance, and its far-reaching arms were soon feeling about in Northamptonshire for a reply to Whitgift which was said to be printing there. Cambridge had long been smouldering with discontent at the treatment of its darling Cartwright: followers of his, such as Chark, by repeating his tenets openly, had kindled a great flame, and grave heads of houses became militant precisians. The conventing now extended to lay people. In the diocese of Peterborough the requirements for ministers were twofold—first, an assurance that they approved and would use the prayer-book and no other, with its rites, forms, and ceremonies; and secondly, a separate protestation of their approval of the Ordinal. Various ministers refused and were deprived. Similar contests, no doubt, were taking place everywhere; and even in the lax and puritan diocese of Norwich the ecclesiastical courts were busy with a defamer of the book and of the conforming clergy.

The experiences of Edward Dering form a vivid specimen of what was going on. After a distinguished career at Cambridge he found himself in trouble for certain opinions, including a misliking of the habits: but The troubles of Dering, he was soon in high repute again, and entrusted by the archbishop, in November 1572, with the task of answering the last new piece of Louvainian controversy, Sanders' book, *De visibili monarchia*. He had made some reputation by a reply to Harding in 1568, but his attempts were unsatisfactory, for puritans never have known how to uphold the Church against Romanist attacks. In the following summer, while lecturing at St. Paul's on the Hebrews, he was suspended by the Council in consequence of some of his statements. The Bishop of London at first spoke well of him; and, as he was a popular preacher and well liked by the councillors of puritan leanings, he was restored. But this action, taken by the Council in spite of Dering's unsatisfactory replies, and without any consultation with "spiritual men," evoked a protest from the Archbishop and the Bishops of Ely and London, for the last named had in the interval found out his mistake in thinking that Dering would be reasonable if generously handled.

The queen also intervened, and thereupon the Council again suspended him on July 22. In September he opened negotiations with Burghley, asking to be told the charges against him, and to be judged by the bishops rather than by the Council. In a later letter he protested that though his views were, as he frankly stated, puritan, he had not spoken anything in his lectures of which complaint could be made: and agreeably with this, when at last he was charged before the Council in the Star Chamber, on November 27, the complaints were based on a conversation at dinner in which he had handled the shortcomings of god-parents and the problems of poverty which the new poor law was now bringing into prominence, and had humourously suggested that Parker might be the last of the Archbishops of Canterbury.

Dering seems to have justified himself on these points, but so learned a leader and so close a friend of Cartwright could not be let go easily. Some assurance was ^{leading up to his final suspension.} needed of his loyalty to the existing Church polity, especially at a moment when Cartwright was in hiding and a warrant was issued for his apprehension. A series of twenty articles touching the main features of the puritan platform was ministered to him, and to these he wrote learned and discriminating replies, showing that he was willing to go as far as conscience would allow him towards agreement, and that he would be no separatist nor hasty abuser of established order. Subsequently he was ordered to make another reply, touching four points only: the Articles, the supremacy, the prayer-book, and the use of preaching and sacraments; he acknowledged all four, but against all but the second he felt bound to make some exceptions. This was not satisfactory, and therefore he remained suspended: and, in spite of efforts which were made on his behalf, he was silenced till the day of his death, June 26, 1576. He may stand as a favourable specimen of the better class of puritan, who wished to be peaceable, so far as scrupulosity would allow him; who combined the outspoken style common to his fellows with a humility which was uncommon, and their usual narrowness of outlook with an unusual respect for other views. For that very reason his case shows more clearly than the case of any more irreconcilable person, how fundamentally impossible

it was for the Church to conciliate the puritan temper or to comprehend the puritan tenets in its own catholic system of doctrine and discipline.

Still Parker had to play the unpopular part: the populace was set against the bishops, and even when the queen issued a proclamation ordering that all who had copies of the *Admonition* and similar publications should bring them in to the bishop of the diocese within twenty days, not a single book was brought to the Bishop of London within that time. In the following October a new proclamation ordered the better enforcement of the Act of Uniformity, and blamed the bishops for all the disorders. When the Council was congratulated by the Lord Treasurer Burghley on its zeal for conformity, the archbishop "doubted whether to smile or lament," for it was notorious that Leicester and others of the Council were continually shielding the Puritans and thwarting the bishops. The Bishop of London thought that something might be effected by a national council or by action of convocation, but nothing came of the proposal. The privy council was then moved to follow up the queen's proclamation with something more personal, and sent a letter to each of the bishops, dated November 7, 1573, reproaching them for the condition of things and ordering the enforcement of uniformity by visitation. Simultaneously lay commissions were appointed in different places to see to the punishment of offenders, and the Treasurer, on November 28, made a solemn speech in the queen's name in the Star Chamber, urging the reluctant, both clergy and laity, to the same end.

The blame which was spread so evenly was very unevenly deserved. Parker had been busy the last autumn with a visitation of his church and diocese, and others had been doing the like. When the new order came from the Council, London and Norwich were two dioceses where action was most needed and where it was taken. In London the archdeacon and chancellor summoned the clergy to subscribe at St. Lawrence Jewry: the compliance was such as to disappoint a thoroughgoing nonconformist such as Wilcox, now recently emerged from prison: but the city prisons still held a certain number

The government goads on the bishops.

Action is taken in London and Norwich especially.

of confessors. More exact details are extant of the result of the proceedings in Parkhurst's diocese, and they show that, when brought to the point, there were few that refused subscription. A sentence of the return from the archdeaconry of Suffolk is very significant: "Many churches, as yet, have no surplices, but the ministers have consented to wear them so soon as they be provided." Even in this instance Parkhurst's administration, equally with that of his subordinates, was exceedingly lax: ministers who were suspended were yet allowed to catechise in the parish churches and to use the exercise of prophesying in the open congregation: thereby they came off victorious, for they continued to preach and were spared from using the prayer-book, which they disliked. On the intervention of one of the commissioners to point out the scandal, Parkhurst wrote to his chancellor and put a stop to it: but at the same time he excused his action to another of the commissioners of puritan leanings by saying that he did not dare do otherwise in face of the opposition which the lenity had evoked.

This was but the beginning of these troubles. The "gift of prophesy" was sincerely coveted by the best of the puritan ministers, and it was in order to detect and develop it that such exercises of the clergy were devised as have been already described at Northampton.

The first troubles about prophesying, 1574.

Similar exercises Parkhurst had encouraged for some little time now, believing this "expounding of the Scriptures by way of prophesy" to be really valuable. Now, after two undisturbed years, perhaps in consequence of the ill-advised lenity shown to the suspended ministers, tidings came to the queen of these meetings; and she, seeing how prone they would be to the dissemination of puritanism and non-conformity, ordered the archbishop to have the "vain prophesyings" suppressed. Parker at once sent word to that effect to the bishops of the province; and to Parkhurst in particular he sent on March 25 a special order by his chaplain. The bishop wrote back, willing to stop whatever was "vain" in the prophesyings, but not the exercises themselves: and presently to his comfort there reached him a letter from the Council of May 6, regretting that some ill-disposed people spoke evil of the exercises, and urging that so long as they

could be kept free from abuses they should be continued. Parker, not knowing of the Council's letter, wrote curtly to the bishop, telling him in effect not to quibble, and demanding to know who had sent contrary orders. The bishop in some dismay appealed to the Bishop of London, who had signed the letter from the Council, to know what he was to do. To this letter Grindal apparently paid no attention; he must equally have neglected also the archbishop's direction to communicate the prohibition to the rest of the province (if he ever received it); for later, when Parkhurst wrote in despair to the Bishop of Rochester to know what was being done, the reply came on June 13 that nothing was done either in the diocese of Rochester or that of London beyond taking measures to keep out controversy. Meanwhile, however, the repressive measures had won the day, and a week earlier Parkhurst had written his submission to the primate, and his orders to his chancellor to suppress the prophesyings. He still felt some soreness both on this question and also on the simultaneous enforcement of the wafer-bread, to which he was much opposed; but the question was closed for a time, and when it was reopened it was with other principals, for Parkhurst as well as Parker died within the year.

These closing months of the archbishop's life were full of many sadnesses; apart from the painful disease which had been disabling him for the last two or three years, there were the incessant church troubles, plots ^{Parker's antiquarian recreations.} real and pretended, controversies with puritan lords and puritan ministers; novel and ugly sectaries, such as the Anabaptists and the Family of Love, needed to be carefully watched, and a new presbyterian manifesto in the shape of Travers' *Disciplina* required an answer. He struggled on bravely to the end, consoling himself with literary and antiquarian studies, such as had been his hobby all through life. The *De antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ* was congenial, for it contained the lives of all the archbishops of Canterbury from the time of Augustine, "my first predecessor," down to his own time. The edition of Asser's *Life of Alfred* had for him even more special interest; much of the work, when not done actually by himself, was done under his own eye, the binding in his own house, and the

casting of special type of the Anglo-Saxon style under his own supervision.

Another pleasing interlude which gratified his courtly heart was his entertainment of the queen in the summer of 1573.

His entertain-
ment of the
queen. Like many another prelate who loved simplicity in his private life, he knew how to play the *grand*

seigneur on occasion; his methodical mind planned the whole visit with great minuteness, and carried through all the details with signal success: it was characteristic that he kept up the old traditions of the reception of a monarch by the convent at Canterbury, adapting the ceremonial of the old Processional to the altered conditions. Parker himself, with the Bishops of Rochester and Lincoln and his suffragan of Dover, met her at the west door of the cathedral; the "grammarian" made his oration to her as she remained on horseback: she then alighted, and the bishops, still in their rochets and chimeres, knelt and said a psalm and some collects. Within the church stood the dean and chapter, with the choir on either side, and as the queen went under a canopy to her traverse placed by the communion board, they escorted her with "a square song." Evensong followed, according to custom. On the Sunday the queen went to sermon either in the cathedral or in the chapter house, which was the usual place of sermons; but apparently she did not come to communicate, though the archbishop was the more anxious that she should do so as it was the first Sunday of the month, "when others customably receive."

In the closing months of his life, as the animosity of his enemies and of Leicester in particular increased, his timid friends failed him, and his last letter contains ominous fore-

His death,
May 17, 1575; bodings. The queen stood almost alone by him in being offended with the Puritans, "whose governance in conclusion will undo her and all others that depend upon her." He saw the anarchical character of the puritan individualism, and protested that what he had sought to enforce was not cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread, but obedience to authority. This was his dying *apologia*, and it was not an unworthy one. It was a heavy loss that the Church sustained by his death on May 17, for his hand had steered a true course through the worst hurricanes of change.

The three features of his character which stand out most clearly are his gentleness, his firm honesty, and his catholic temper; and they stand out all the more clearly against the general background of contemporary ^{his character;} life, where bitterness, self-seeking, and wild innovation were only too common, even among the heads of the Church. The same mildness which intervened to prevent the bloody consequences that might have followed from the act of 1563 was shown in his personal dealings both with recusant and puritan: and probably no one in the kingdom laboured so earnestly to bring men to conformity by persuasion and reasonableness as did the archbishop. Yet he could stand out sturdily not only against disobedience but also against shady transactions in high quarters; he did not hesitate to refuse to institute a patron's nominee if he was unworthy; he imperilled his friendship with the Lord Keeper by his honesty; he became Leicester's enemy partly because he would not allow him to shield evildoers; he was one of the few men in the kingdom who ever dared to thwart the queen.

His catholic temper was no doubt partly the result of his conservative tastes; his reverence for precedent made him careful to keep to the old ways; his official forms—^{the significance of his labours.} his letters of orders, for example, and his notices of ordination—are the old forms, and his commission to his suffragan authorised him not only to confirm and ordain but also to reconcile polluted churches—a small point but full of significance. This was far more than mere conservatism: as a scholar who had lived through the changes of an eventful two-and-seventy years, he had come to definite and matured convictions. In his preface to the Bible he wrote his own belief when he said: "We will proceed in the reformation begun, and doubt not by the help of Christ his grace of the true unity to Christ's Catholic Church and of the uprightness of our faith in this province." To him more than to any one else, apart from the queen, it is due that such was the line of reformation followed; yet hitherto the Church which he so faithfully served and so adroitly steered has hardly given him all the gratitude that he deserves for preserving, in the hour of greatest peril, its order of faith and worship, its ministry, its sacraments—nay, even its very existence.

AUTHORITIES.—For the proceedings in London see Earl's *Diary*, *u.s.* For accounts of puritan sufferings and woes, see *A part of a Register*; Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, contains some few valuable items. For Whittingham, see *Camden Misc.* vi. For Parkhurst, see Gorham, *Reformation Gleanings*. The Bill for Rites and Ceremonies 1572 is in *S.P. Dom.* lxxxvi. 45-47. The *Admonitions* and other tracts are reprinted in the Church Historical Society Tract, No. lxxii.

CHAPTER XI

GRINDAL'S FAILURE

WITH the death of Parker the scene changes and the interest diminishes : the points at issue are of less vital moment, and the men are of inferior quality. Much time and heat were expended by the bishops in quarrels among themselves about their dilapidations, or with their neighbours about their leases, or with their officers

The abuses
current at
Grindal's
accession,
1575.

about their jurisdiction. There was a large proportion of the new set of bishops whose administration never rose much above this level, while it readily descended to self-seeking and even dishonesty. The blame of all this belongs in large measure to the queen ; she systematically continued her depredations, making a large revenue alike by keeping sees vacant and by nominating men to fill them. The bishops recouped themselves by following her example, and so the evil spread to the lesser officials, both clerical and lay. The execution of church discipline was strenuous—that was a political necessity—and, being corrupt and unfair, it grew in unpopularity. Thus the swelling cry of the Puritans against episcopacy had much in the way of abuses to justify it and to make it an effective recruiting agency ; while, on the other hand, the appeal of the romanist recusant led many of the more religiously inclined to forsake a Church which was daily sinking deeper into a sea of corruption.

The new archbishop might have done something to check this process : if he was stern and puritanical, he was at any rate honest ; and, being unmarried, he was less tempted than many to enrich himself and his family at the expense of the Church. The eight years of

His own
ineffective-
ness.

his primacy, however, are in striking contrast with the rule of Parker through their ineffectiveness. This was partly due to the natural incapacity for government which Grindal had already shown as Bishop of London, and partly due to a particular piece of characteristically puritan crankiness, which nearly cost him his see altogether.

The first year of his tenure was not without promise, for the sessions of convocation at the beginning of 1576 produced a valuable set of disciplinary canons. The greater
The canons of 1576. number concerned the clergy: they regulated the admission of men to orders and to benefices, dealt drastically with unlearned and counterfeit ministers, reviewed the preachers' licenses and exhorted men to study and to aim at greater regularity and efficiency in preaching and catechising. Two canons dealt with the faulty procedure of the ecclesiastical courts, threatening suspension to all ordinaries who neglected to proceed against persons presented to them, and restricting to exceptional cases the much abused commutation for money of ecclesiastical penances.

This code, as it received the assent of the convocation of Canterbury on March 17, 1576, contained fifteen canons: when, however, the archbishop published them by
Two fall victims to the royal veto. mandate to the province, dated April 20, and they appeared in print with a royal authorisation, two had disappeared. The first of these had abolished the old restrictions, which prevented marriage in Advent, Lent, and other special periods of the year; the second had set out that the bishops, acting on the interpretative power to resolve doubts about the prayer-book which was specially reserved to them in the preface, interpreted the directions for private baptism as referring only to "lawful minister or deacon," and not to lay persons. Such innovations as these were not to the queen's liking, and she used the power secured to the Crown by the Henrician legislation of refusing her assent to their promulgation. The result of her refusal was that the Puritans had two grievances the more, and for the rest of the reign the bishops were divided in this point of policy about baptism. Parker in licensing a midwife had expressly recognised her duty to baptize in case of urgency; other bishops, *e.g.* Bishop Barnes of Durham, now on their own authority withdrew this function

from all women, reserving it to the "minister or some other godly and discreet person." In spite of the queen the way was thus prepared for the changes made after the Hampton Court conference in 1603; but in the matter of the prohibited times for marriage the old rule was maintained even by the innovating Bishop Barnes.

When convocation was prorogued, Grindal was proceeding to a visitation of his province, which was intended to be strict with regard to all declensions towards the old customs and views, but very lenient to all innovation. He was also busy in a revision of his courts in conjunction with the privy council, especially in reviewing the dispensations issued from the Court of Faculties. Many of these were now to be given up; the holding of more than two benefices and the possession of benefices by young men under age were no longer to be allowed; letters dimissory and marriage licenses also were to disappear; but commendams and licenses to hold two benefices were to continue, as well as dispensations for illegitimate men to receive holy orders, for laymen to hold some benefices without cure of souls, for clergy to be non-resident, and for the eating of meat in Lent. It does not, however, appear that this scheme ever became effective, though it was agreed upon by the archbishop and Council on June 20, 1576, was retouched a year and a half later, and was then expedited to Ireland after a further interval of a year, for the guidance of the Master of Faculties there.

But this activity was of a sudden cut short, for the prophesyings which had already got Parkhurst into serious trouble, were to deal more unkindly still with the archbishop. The queen, perceiving that such gatherings were being used to propagate nonconformity and discontent, called on the primate to suppress them. Grindal instead attempted to regulate them, hoping to secure what was good by eliminating what was dangerous and obnoxious to the queen. He designed to bring them directly under episcopal control, to exclude the laity and all deprived or inhibited ministers, and to silence the first words of "invective" against authority. The queen would not hear of any half measures; and a long letter of protest which Grindal

Grindal
begins with a
reform as to
faculties;

which is cut
short by
a quarrel
with the
Crown about
prophesying.

sent on December 20, 1576, in defence of the value of the much preaching and of the "exercises," only made her more determined. Claiming to speak in the name of ten other bishops, he extolled the prophesyings: he refused on conscientious grounds to suppress them, and, to make matters worse, ended his letter by urging the queen to refer all religious matters to the bishops and divines, as she referred legal matters to the judges, and to curb the peremptoriness of her own dealings with subjects of faith and religion.

This was greater boldness than Elizabeth could stand: as the archbishop, the usual medium of her communications to the episcopate, proved obdurate, she sent her orders direct, first by letters on the subject to individual bishops, and later by a general letter to all, dated May 8, 1577, which dealt also with conformity and the vexed question of preaching and preachers. Officially thenceforward the prophesyings ceased; but the question was not really closed. In some dioceses, where the bishops approved, "exercises" of a very similar character went on. In 1581 a form of exercise was set forth by Sandys, who had succeeded Grindal as Archbishop of York. This was used in the northern province with the queen's approval, and elsewhere something of the same sort was held in many of the chapters of the archdeacons, side by side with the examination on the "tasks" in Holy Scripture, which were set to the clergy from time to time in accordance with the order given in the Advertisements. When, on the contrary, the clergy were restricted to a formal examination in their tasks, the prophesying went on in subterranean fashion, breaking out at intervals as the puritan claim for liberty of prophesying grew.

Grindal meanwhile was in disgrace and sequestered for six months by order of the queen and Council, in spite of the protest of the Bishop of Ely. This involved his suspension from ecclesiastical though not from spiritual functions, and produced a curious state of things. His visitation was carried on by officials in his stead, nominated by him and appointed by the Council: and when he acted as intermediary between the Crown and the ordinaries he did so through the Council. He took no part in the consecration of May as Bishop of Carlisle, which was performed by the

They are
nominally
suppressed,

and Grindal
sequestered.

Bishops of London, Chester, Rochester, and Dover at Fulham on September 29, 1577. When the six months of his sentence expired in November, he was not restored to his position, but he took his share in subsequent consecrations. Efforts were made to induce him to submit and acknowledge the queen to be in the right and himself in the wrong: but though he wrote dolorously enough to the Council on October 24 and November 30, he still pleaded conscientious objections. The paralysing inconvenience of the situation, so far from making the queen relent, only raised the question in her mind whether he should not be deprived, until the Council prevailed upon her to tolerate the inconvenience rather than proceed to such an extreme and dubious measure as deprivation.

The archbishop was still confined to his palace, and the anomalous state of things thus continued. When convocation met again, in January 1580, the Bishop of London presided, and a petition was made to the queen on the archbishop's behalf, by twelve bishops of the province as well as by others of the convocation. Their pleading was in vain: convocation itself languished ineffectively for want of the "*summus in Ecclesia Anglicana Sacerdos dei*." Grindal continued in disgrace till blindness and sickness in the beginning of 1583 led him to accept the queen's suggestion of a resignation, and death spared him the necessity of it.

While the archbishop sat paralysed and powerless, ecclesiastical movements of great magnitude were going forward, and puritanism in particular was developing both in scope and character. Already, before Parker's death, the appearance of the *Admonition* had marked the transition of puritanism from a discontent to a hostility—a new shape in which it was now opposed by those who up to that time had been in its favour, such as Parkhurst among the bishops, and Humphrey and Sampson among the doctors. The grievances remained the same, but the determination was now becoming definite that they could only be redressed by sweeping away the episcopal system, and establishing in its place a presbyterian discipline. There had grown out of the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift over the *Admonition* the celebrated *Book of Discipline*, published abroad by Travers in 1574 in the

His disgrace
and death,
July 6, 1583

The develop-
ment of
puritanism

Latin form, and almost at once put forth also by Cartwright in an English dress under the title *A full and plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline*. This work fixed the policy of the proposed reform or revolution, and became so authoritative that its adherents began to bind themselves to it by a definite subscription.

In the calm of Grindal's sequestration its principles spread apace. Even controversy ceased with the issue of Cartwright's *Second Reply* to Whitgift in 1577; and apart from in an interval of comparative immunity, 1577-1583, the issue in 1578 of a tract by Anthony Gilby, written in Parker's time, against episcopal administration, and entitled *A View of Antichrist*, there was silence in this corner of the battle until Robert Browne broke it in 1582.

A similar calm pervaded the judicial area. This was not wholly due to laxity or favour towards puritanism, but partly also to the fact that all attention, whether literary or judicial, was absorbed by the dealings with recusancy. Here and there evidence of legal proceedings comes out. In 1576 Bishop Freke had suspended a preacher of Norwich, Richard Gawton by name, who refused the surplice, set at nought the rubrics, preached without license, and repudiated the existing Church government; and as Gawton was a friend of London ministers such as Field and Wilcox, his treatment attracted some attention. The same was the case when Francis Merbury was sent up from Northampton to the commission in London for similar offences, and remitted thence for his third imprisonment. But such things were, comparatively speaking, unusual at this period; there had been a marked absence of such dealings during Grindal's day as compared with the latter days of Parker; and now many arrears had accumulated to be dealt with by a fresh and vigorous hand.

It is true that in less summary fashion a good deal of quiet pressure had been put upon the recalcitrant both by episcopal and civil authority. The Council was continually urging on the bishops, as well as taking steps on its own account. For example, it insisted in 1579 but marked by some repressive action. that they should not tolerate the growing custom by which some preachers emphasised their contempt for a mere reading ministry, and their dislike of the prayer-book by

refusing themselves to read the prayers or celebrate the holy communion. In the diocese of London there was plenty of activity. Following on the inquiry about "no-sacrament ministers," to which answer had to be made by March 1, came a repetition of it in August, and then a new call in September, with exhortation about eucharistic doctrine, about the courtship of the Duc d'Alençon, which was causing alarm to protestant hearts, and about Stubbs' libellous book, called *The Gaping Gulph*, which caused much turmoil by its outspoken disapproval of the match, and cost the author his right hand. In 1580 the London clergy were twice summoned, in August for the bishop's visitation, and in November for an inquiry after recusants, while a similar inquiry was twice repeated in January of the year following. In that diocese, at any rate, it could hardly be said that there was no supervision. It clearly did not stand alone in this respect. From the diocese of Chester, for example, there come interesting evidences of active administration. In January 1581 the bishop sent up to the Council a series of proposals to be laid before parliament. The Council, in reply, warmly commended his zeal, and agreed to refer to the settlement of parliament two points, viz. the use of wafer-bread and the prohibition of fairs on Sundays and of trading before morning prayer. Meanwhile it advised that either kind of bread should be allowed, according to the custom actually prevailing in the various churches. The rebellion with regard to these two points illustrates the way in which the Puritans were upsetting the existing order, not without some considerable protest from its maintainers.

The zealots were making a great effort to transform Sunday. Not only inside the churches were they reducing everything to Genevan bareness, but outside, too, they were suppressing, often with high assistance, the amusements and occupations which had hitherto been considered harmless recreations after service was over, as well as the traffic which had developed of late side by side with the growth of worldliness. This crusade raised much opposition, sometimes even riots. On other points also protests arose against the innovations which, musty and dispassionate now, bring back to-day the memory of hot

Sabbatarianism in the ascendant.

encounters. There were many who did not naturally feel that an organ was a mark of iniquity inside a church, or a maypole outside; and they claimed their old liberties. The people of Christchurch, in the City, protested against the removal of the singing men from the choir. They are willing that the preachers should continue, and even the daily lectures, but the poor must have their doles as before, the service must go on as hitherto on Sundays, Holy days, and other occasions, and must be said and sung by the same ministers, clerks, and conducts as are now serving: so at least some eighty sturdy parishioners have made up their minds. But innovation and disregard of the customs and orders of the Church went on in many quarters unchecked.

The parliamentary agitation still continued. The opening of the sessions of 1576 brought Peter Wentworth forward with an attempt to govern the Church by parliament, which involved him in disgrace with the queen for interference in affairs that belonged to her prerogative, and in a sequestration from his parliamentary duties for over a month. In the parliament of 1581 his brother Paul put in a meddling hand, not this time in complaint of the bishops or of the existing order of the Church, but merely to secure a public fast and preaching for the House; the queen, however, had grown sensitive, and the name of the mover was suggestive. Since the previous parliament Peter had been in fresh trouble: the Council had censured him because he allowed nonconformists to resort in numbers to his house and "to receive the sacrament there after another sort." So Paul's action had all the less chance, and speedily a royal message descended to crush his proposal.

There were also other and more important signs of the dissatisfaction of parliament with the state of ecclesiastical affairs. A petition to the Crown for the reformation of discipline was drawn up and entrusted to the privy council. It had even reached in March 1576 the point of developing into a bill, when again the queen stopped proceedings, saying that she had been conferring already with the bishops on the matter, and would see that there was redress of the grievances through their

Puritan
action in
parliament
led by the
Wentworths,
Feb. 8 to
March 15,
1576,

and January
16 to March
18, 1581.

Petitions
of the
Commons
about ecclesi-
astical affairs.

agency. The next session, however, found things no better: the Commons made a formal appeal to the Crown to remedy abuses, alleging especially four things—the incapacity of the clergy and the abuse of discipline by wrongful excommunication, commutation of penance, and excessive dispensations. The clamour for reform was shared by the Lower House of convocation, which, to remedy these abuses, drew up articles of its own, calling on the bishops for reform.

The queen sent for Archbishop Sandys, and he, with five other bishops, met the deputation from the Commons, and agreed upon a programme of reform, which must have been considerable, since the archbishop judged that it would necessitate a new act of parliament.

*Quashed by
the queen.*

But the queen would have none of it; and, when pressed by the archbishop for a reply, she only said that she would not tolerate the interference of parliament in the matter. A smaller programme was then drawn up by the bishops, which dealt mainly with reforms in the studies and learning of the clergy and the duty of preaching, and was to be carried out by simple episcopal authority. This obtained the queen's consent, and was put in force; but, not unnaturally, it was insufficient to stop complaints.

The real nature of the widening rift between the two parties can be best understood from another transaction of the time. Among the complaints now formulated

was a set of twenty-six articles "exhibited" in the Commons. A reply to these was drawn up on the episcopal side, probably by Whitgift, and

*The nature of
the complaints
and the epis-
copal reply.*

though apparently it never reached its mark, it shows clearly the state of the case. Each document witnessed to the large hold that the puritan discipline had gained on the minds of the clergy. The complaint demanded that no one should be ordained except to a cure of souls, that the rights of patronage should be so far modified as to allow the parishioners time to protest against the patron's nominee; that the obligation of fellows of colleges and others to be ordained should be dispensed with in the case of students of divinity; that ordination candidates should have the approval of a presbytery, in the form of the dean and chapter of the diocese, together with six licensed preachers,

who should be present and assist at the ordination. These demands show a very close affinity to the Genevan system, which Cartwright and Travers had for ten years been zealously recommending, and which was already glorified by its advocates with the name of "The Holy Discipline." In this particular form they represented an attempt at a compromise with episcopacy, such as puritanism was willing to tolerate for the time, until the reforming away of the bishops could be thoroughly carried out. The unyielding attitude which the bishops adopted towards these sweeping demands soon made the opposition more uncompromising.

With regard to other matters, the episcopal reply was no less unyielding. It attempted to defend the existing system of excommunication, according to which this solemn and supreme penalty was meted out broadcast by laymen sitting as judges to all and every offender in the ecclesiastical courts, regardless of whether his offence was a mere legal technicality or a serious moral lapse. It was a great misfortune for the Church that a real scandal such as this, which rightly distressed the minds of thoughtful churchmen and pious idealists, among whom were the best of the puritan party, should not have been singled out from the list for redress; but the bishops in this matter were in the hands of their lawyers, and this is one of the many occasions in which they, and the Church through them, have had to suffer for it.

Though little was effected of the large revolution demanded by the Commons, or even of the smaller scheme of reform to which the episcopate was ready to agree, it cannot be said that the bishops remained inactive. They were seriously promoting the performance of those clerical duties which, as the Puritans complained, were being neglected. At the visitations, inquiry was strictly being made as to the preaching of sermons, the catechising of the children, as to the studies of the clergy, and even as to the testimonials which the parson brought with him at his coming, the amount of residence that he has kept, and the other cures that he may be holding. Nor were the courts, which were customarily held in the name of the bishop or of the archdeacon, by their officials, forgotten in these inquiries; search was made to detect

Attempts to
justify some
abuses,

but success-
ful reform of
others.

the abuses, of which so much was made, and which, to all appearance, were certainly not imaginary. These are signs that there was a real activity on behalf of reform and redress, at any rate, on the part of the more active of the bishops; but, no doubt, it was not the sort of action that the disaffected and the petitioners desired.

The growing presbyterian spirit among the Puritans also called up the question of the validity of orders conferred outside England by the presbytery. A crucial case was that of Whittingham, Dean of Durham, whose ^{Contest about presbyterian ordination.} earlier troubles have already been mentioned. In 1578 Archbishop Sandys instituted a metropolitical visitation of the church of Durham. There was the usual squabble over this action, and the most important outcome of it all was that Dean Whittingham was about to be deprived because, amongst other things—being in the eyes of the law of the English Church a mere layman—he had presumed to celebrate the holy communion in the cathedral. The case was hotly contested; the visitation was adjourned to York, and, when it ended with the case still unsettled, the Council began to inquire into the matter. The dean pleaded that his Genevan orders proved him to be no layman; others urged that he had not received even the Genevan orders in due form; while behind both lay the fact, which the dean himself did not dispute, that he was “neither deacon nor minister according to the laws of this realm.” In the midst of the dispute the dean died, and so escaped the deprivation which would otherwise have overtaken him.

It is not probable that even in the prevailing lawlessness cases such as this were common. Though presbyterian ministers or laymen might be appointed even by the Crown to benefices without cure of souls, they were not expected to exercise any ministry. That they occasionally did so, and that people in high positions may have connived, will surprise no one who has realised how steadily at this period the puritan leaven was working within the Church. But as the illegality of such action became more clear, and the chances of a presbyterian movement reversing the existing order became less and less, the action became more impossible. Grindal, however, was not the man to define

The
unchecked
infection of
puritanism.

the limits between presbyterian puritanism and churchmanship. His primacy only served to increase confusion, and it was left for his successor to fight the battle for the principles of the Church.

The last months of Grindal's life witnessed the beginning of protestant martyrdoms, consequent on the first steps of overt separation. Hitherto, though conventicles had been held, they had not involved a separation from the Church. Robert Browne himself, the first teacher of the tenets of independency, when he began his preaching in the gravel pits of Islington, had not as yet any idea of breaking away from the unity of the Church. In 1578, when the plague drove him from London, he returned to Cambridge, where, besides becoming a noted preacher, he began to develop the views which were soon to be called Brownist after him. Intolerance of existing Church order made him repudiate not only the preacher's license which had been procured by his brother for him from the Bishop of Ely, but also the whole doctrine of holy orders. From this position he was led on to attempt a new reformation by that craving for a spiritual Church free from all abuses which has again and again laid hold of certain devout and ardent men. More logical than the non-conformist, who remained as yet in the Church while conscientiously opposed to it, he saw that his reformation involved separation, and the substituting for the Catholic Church of a new organisation made up of "the worthiest, were they never so few." In thus proclaiming the principle of separation he took up solid ground, to which it was inevitable that in time the nonconformists must transfer themselves, unless indeed they returned to the historic principles of the Church. Their existing position was an untenable one, and hardly more legal or less liable to punishment than that of the Sectary.

When Robert Harrison came to Cambridge and allied himself with Browne, their ideas began to take practical shape; and, despairing of Cambridge, the two friends went to the eastern counties, a district already well known to Harrison. Their teaching soon brought them into conflict with the bishop, and in April 1581, Harrison was inhibited, and the aid of Burghley was invoked to control Browne, who was in some degree related to the lord treasurer.

Browne and
the rise of
independency.

Its progress
in England

Gentle treatment was thrown away upon him; twice more in the next few months he was again in trouble for his contentious preaching, and the neighbourhood of Bury was infected with disorder. After the bishop, archbishop, and treasurer had alike failed to bring him to order, and he had evidently exhausted their patience, he took Harrison and his select body of followers with him, and fled to the English colony at Middelburg, in the Low Countries.

Trouble pursued them there too, for such exclusive tenets as theirs found no favour with the colony of English puritan nonconformists who assembled there under the pastorate of Cartwright and Fenner. Though they were united in refusal of the hierarchy of the Church, and though Browne wished as much as any one to substitute a government of pastors and elders, etc., for "priests, parsons, vicars, curates, and the rest of that rabble," they differed as to their practical action. *Reformation without tarrying for any*, the title of Browne's manifesto issued at Middelburg, sums up his contention. The persons attacked in the treatise are not the English hierarchy, but the preachers who hesitate to reform in defiance of authority, saying that because "they cannot remedy things, therefore they will tolerate" them. Here, in fact, is the dividing line between separatism and nonconformity—the Nonconformist wished to cling to the outward organisation of the Church while seeking to reform or even to revolutionise it; the Separatist wished to cling to the Church only in a spiritual sense, meaning by the term a body of believers which was to be formed anew, since the existing bodies were condemned by their subservience to civil authority. Browne therefore followed up his manifesto with *A booke which sheweth the Life and Manners of all true Christians, and howe unlike they are unto Turks and Papistes and Heathen Folke*, a tabular catechetical statement of his views as to the true Church as contrasted with the false, written as a reply to the nonconformist "accusations and slanders of forsaking and condemning the Church."

These and other books of Browne and Harrison made their way among the adherents whom they left behind in the eastern counties, in spite of a proclamation issued on June 30, 1583, calling in their "seditious, schismatical, and

erroneous printed books and libels to be burned by the ordinary. Fired by the repudiation of the ecclesiastical authority of the Crown in Browne's book, one Thomas Gibson, bookbinder, of Bury, was ill-advised enough to set up opprobrious texts on either side of the royal arms in his parish church; and when it was further discovered that he had bound and circulated these defamatory libels, he was sent for trial to the assizes. With him there appeared two other men, Coppin and Thacker, whose connexion with Browne and his works is more obscure. Coppin had been sent to prison at Bury early in 1577 by the bishop's commissary for ecclesiastical disobedience; in the following year he was in trouble for violent language against ministers and against the queen. Thacker also had for some considerable time been in prison for unorthodox words and behaviour. All alike were convicted of the offence of disseminating seditious books of Browne and Harrison; but apparently, when the question of the ecclesiastical supremacy was propounded to them, a division took place. Thacker and Coppin took Browne's line, and, following his manifesto, would not allow to the Crown any but civil authority; Gibson apparently satisfied Chief-Justice Wray on this—the only point the government was disposed to press—and was therefore reprieved. The other two resisted all persuasion, and suffered the extreme penalty. The feeling of the neighbourhood had long been strong on the side of the Brownists: the proceedings against Coppin had already been delayed from a wish to secure quiet; but still there was fear of an uproar. To avoid possible trouble, Thacker was taken straight from court to be hanged, and Coppin followed on the next day; while a bonfire of Browne's books added to the impression which the government sought to make by this example of severity.

AUTHORITIES.—For the Canons of 1576 see Cardwell, *Synodalia*. For Bishop Barnes at Durham see his *Eccl. Proceedings* (Surtees Soc. vol. xxii.). For the question of dispensations see *Privy Council Acts*, Jan. 15, 1579, and *S.P. Dom.* cxxix. 25. On the prophesyings see, besides Strype, Bodley's Libr., Tanner MS. 79; Brit. Mus., Harl. MS. 36, p. 391; *S.P. Dom.* cxviii. 9; cxvii. 15. For the affair at Chester see *S.P. Dom.* cxlvii. 8, and Bodley's Libr., Tanner MS. 79, f. 146. The Christchurch protest is in *S.P. Dom.* cxlvi. 134.

On Peter Wentworth and the Parliament of 1576 see *S.P. Dom.* cvii.; and for 1581, *ib.* cxlvii. cxlviii. Visitation articles of this period are in

The first
martyrs in
England,
June 1583.

Ritual Commission Report, Appendix E; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*; Grindal, *Remains*; the Rochester Registers, York Register, *S.P. Dom.* cix. 21; and cp. the Orders of 1581 in *S.P. Dom.* cxlvi. 79, and *S.P. Dom.* clxv. 1, 2. For Whittingham see above, and for other cases see Denny, *Engl. Ch. and Ministry of Ref. Churches* (Ch. Hist. Soc. Tract, lvii.). For Browne see Lansd. MS. xxxiii., Brook; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, art. "Browne, Robert"; and Dexter, *Congregationalism*. His books are rare and have not been reprinted. Chief-Justice Wray's Report on the trial of Gibson and the others is in Lansd. MS. xxxviii. 64. For Coppin see Lansd. MS. xxvii. 28.

CHAPTER XII

THE DEVELOPMENT AND REPRESSION OF RECUSANCY

NEITHER the execution of Norfolk nor the respite of Mary gave pause to the agitation of the papists. The Council had its hands full in dealing with recusants; they claimed to be multiplying daily, and were certainly emboldened by the trend of affairs in France and Spain. The blow dealt to French protestantism by the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day in 1572, and to the like party in the Netherlands by Alva's successes, culminating in the sack of Antwerp, seemed sufficient evidence that there was a feeling abroad which must soon come to the succour of the discredited bull of deposition, and wage a holy and victorious war against Elizabeth and English religion. But meanwhile so many were cast into prison that it became necessary to add to the number of places of detention. In March 1572 Wisbeach castle was picked out for the honour, though it was not until 1580 that it became the normal prison for recusants. Imprisonment is not indeed at any time a happy lot, but a policy of leniency was still being pursued. The Marian prelates were set free when age, sickness, or the nearness of the plague gave an excuse for it, and if they did not remain at liberty, it was because they could not be content to keep clear of recusant plots and propaganda. Even those who were caught at the Latin mass were at present merely fined and set free, and only the priests imprisoned. But circumstances were changing.

The generation of Marian clergy was fast passing away: at Parker's death there were none under forty years of age, and the

small number of those who had finally refused the Elizabethan changes was rapidly diminishing. The organisation of recusancy fell into other hands. Allen, after his brief career in England, had foreseen the difficulty, and in order that the cause of Romanism might not die by inanition he had set on foot the English college at the newly-founded University of Douai in 1568. Its first inmates included Bristow, the controversialist, and two other Oxford graduates; in 1569 they were joined, among others, by two further distinguished Oxonians, Stapleton and Dorman, and in the following year the same university sent them five more graduates. The college was then well launched, and students came in numbers from England. In March 1573 a first batch of men received priests' orders, and in the year following the first missionaries, three in number, left for England. This was the small beginning of a great work; the output of the college increased greatly; in 1578, when it was moved from Douai to Reims, in consequences of the disturbances in the Netherlands and the hatred of the English refugees, over fifty priests had already been sent to the English harvest. By the end of 1580, when circumstances again altered, the number had risen to over 110, besides eight men who had been sent from the daughter college established in Rome in 1576.

The first-fruits of the Douai seminary

It is difficult to exaggerate the change which was thus effected. The Marian recusant clergy available for work were few and uninfluential; they had much difficulty in keeping a following together, and little ability for such a task. The new seminary priests were an invading army. Brought up and trained abroad in the new Tridentine theology, accustomed to the new Tridentine service-books, expert in controversy and in the arts of dissimulation which penal laws fostered, buoyed up by false hopes and even ludicrous misrepresentations from England, alienated from the spirit of their country, and infected with the views of her political enemies, it was no wonder that by Englishmen as a whole they were regarded very differently from the old-fashioned Marian priests. They came to the task full of enthusiasm and piety, and they deserve the credit of it: they looked upon the religious condition of England as worse than heathenism, and

produce a new model of recusants.

this is not very surprising when it is borne in mind how rapidly religion had been going from bad to worse. The sacraments had dropped almost out of sight, the churches were profaned and closed, piety was decayed, and a gloom of spiritual apathy had settled over the land, which was only relieved by the wearisomeness of puritan preachers or the droning of Genevan psalms and mumbling of the homilies. The lines of better things had been laid down, but they were not being followed out; and there seemed no clear prospect that the English Church would now recover from the low state of energy to which a succession of severe operations had brought it. The result was a very natural one. Many a timid man fled from such circumstances and took refuge abroad; some, who had been hopeful, despaired, and left what seemed a sinking ship. A reaction after the latest changes turned many back to accept again the papal policy which once they had repudiated, and it landed them at Douai. Thence they returned, ardently set on either winning souls from a state that seemed to them worse than infidelity, or winning a place for themselves on a new roll of martyrdom which had recently opened with the names of Felton and Story. The distinction between the old and the new model was indeed so clear that from the first Marian clergy came to Douai to learn the new methods and to qualify themselves for a dangerous missionary task.

It is not evident how far the Council was alive to the new state of things; but it is clear that in the latter part of 1575 determined efforts were made to deal with recus-

Typical dealings with the gentry of Staffordshire.

ancy. On August 17 four bishops attended the Council meeting, when eight Staffordshire gentlemen were brought up, and on acknowledging their non-attendance at church and pleading conscientious scruples were handed over to the bishops to be brought to a better mind. The episcopal monitions proved fruitless except in one case; the rest were sent to prison before the end of the year. In January one more conformed. Conference was held with the rest, and their confinement was mitigated in case of sickness or business: in June they were sent home till the beginning of the next term, no doubt because of plague; and many of them seem to have spent a good deal of time either in prison

or out on bail. In 1580 the one who first conformed was found in prison, while a good many of the others were at large and by the partiality of the grand jury were not returned as recusants at the end of 1581, whereat the Council was greatly scandalised. One of them seized the opportunity to be married shortly after at a mass, whereon there followed more wrath at the Council and a domiciliary search for "popish trumpery" and "a massing priest." So the weary story drags on for some years: it is no doubt representative of a large class of dealings.

The long tentacles of the Council were haling up men from Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Cornwall, Hants, Berks, and Oxfordshire, while its hundred eyes were watching the ports for the importers of contraband literature from Douai, Antwerp, and Louvain. Some ^{Similar proceedings elsewhere by the Council} were caught and punished. The Bishop of London even found a recusant printer disseminating flat treason in the midst of his city: leniency was shown here, as in other cases, but it proved a useless favour, and the printer continued his course till it was cut short by another arrest a few years later, and by his execution as a traitor. The Council further tried the effect of an autumn campaign in the provinces; it sat, for example, at Norwich in August 1578 and dealt with several batches of recusants of the eastern counties; some conformed, others were given time for conference, while old offenders were sent to prison. Here the episcopal admonitions seem to have been more effective; but many rejected them and went to prison in November. The same story recurs that has already been sketched: some came out of prison on bail for business or for a cure at Bath, others were sent to custody in a private house, while again some that once conformed recanted and returned to prison.

The ecclesiastical authorities were similarly busy, making inquiry for disguised popish priests, distributors of contraband literature, and for people who had been reconciled to the pope or to the Church of Rome. Grindal's ^{and the bishops.} visitation articles show another side of the question also, for they were concerned not only with recusancy but with the conservative love of the old customs still surviving in those who conformed, and manifesting itself in the retention

of "monuments of superstition," old and unprescribed ceremonial at the eucharist and baptism, abrogated fasts and festivals, Latin prayers, beads and popish primers, etc.

Among the early emissaries from Douai one acquired special distinction as being the first priest to suffer death for the cause. Cuthbert Mayne had been at

The history
of Cuthbert
Mayne.

Oxford, and was credited with having received Anglican orders at the age of eighteen before coming to the university. While at St. John's College he changed his religion, and in 1573, perhaps under fear of arrest, he fled to Douai, and underwent reordination. On April 24, 1576, he returned to England with John Paine, fortified not only by the Douai training, but also by a retreat with the Jesuits. Both the missionaries were soon in trouble, together with Shaw, who had gone over earlier in the year and had sent for Mayne. In June 1576 it was reported at Douai that all three had been apprehended and tortured, that their stock-in-trade of books, pictures, blessed incense, *Agnus Dei* trinkets, etc., with which they had been fitted out on leaving Douai, had fallen into the hands of the heretics, and was only recovered by the cleverness of a friend. The priests seem to have been soon released from their first captivity. Paine, after sending back a glowing account of the success of the missionaries in their work, was again reported to be in prison at the beginning of 1577; but gentle counsels still prevailed, and in March he was again released. Several of the successive parties of missionaries on their arrival fell at once into the hands of the government; they too were soon released after examination and a short imprisonment, some of them, as it turned out, being reserved for a later martyrdom.

Such gentle handling could hardly continue, for the men continued to come over in increasing numbers. In June

His second
apprehension,
June 1577; 1577 a move was made towards stronger measures, and the first blow fell upon Cuthbert Mayne, who

had for the last year been living at Golden in Cornwall, with a young landowner named Francis Tregian, passing as his steward. A raid was made upon the house by the sheriff and justices; Mayne was found having in his possession a printed bull, several *Agnus Dei* trinkets, and a treatise against the prayer-book; he himself was lodged in

Launceston gaol, while others were allowed out on bail. The Council, on hearing of the arrest, sent orders for Mayne's trial to be held at the next assizes. Tregian himself they summoned to London, and, as he was professedly a recusant, and obdurate in refusing to conform, he was imprisoned, pending further developments.

In September the trial took place at Launceston. The bull and the *Agnus Dei* formed the chief charges against Mayne, together with the saying of "a certain public and open prayer called a private mass," and "ministering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper after a papistical manner," contrary to the Act of Uniformity. Tregian and other gentry, a schoolmaster, some servants, and others were also charged as aiders and abettors. The evidence, technically speaking, was very weak: it was unfortunate from the prosecutors' point of view that the bull in question was only a bull extending the indulgences of the year of jubilee to English people, and was out of date before Mayne landed; unfortunate also that direct proof was almost wanting of any dissemination of the crystal and silver trinkets, some of which were produced in Court, or of the saying of the mass. It was reported that there was some divergence of opinion between the judges at the trial, and that some pressure had to be put upon the jury, which may well have been the case. At any rate, Mayne was condemned to death for treason according to the Act of 1571, and in respect of his bull, his popery, his trinkets, and the rest, to the penalties of *præmunire*, or "loss of goods, lands, and liberty, during life."

A delay ensued, which was possibly due to legal dissatisfaction with the case and the verdict. Meanwhile Tregian reappeared at the council board, and, being as firm as before, was sent to close imprisonment on September 30, 1577. Later, an order went down from the Council for the execution of Mayne on November 30. On the previous day he underwent a long examination before some justices and clergy, and, as it seems, attempts were made to win him back, or at least to establish his loyalty to the English government; but all proved unavailing: he held himself free to profess civil obedience and loyalty to the Crown for the time, but bound, if called

trial and conviction.
September.

Execution delayed for further inquiry.

upon thereafter, to aid invaders who might come to recover the country to the papal obedience.

It is upon this statement that the judgment of the historian upon the case, which is a typical one, must be chiefly based.

Mayne had not interfered in political action: as a student of Douai he had been trained for spiritual functions. Allen, while he played his own part in political machinations abroad, kept his college free from all that side of the question; and Mayne no doubt spoke truth when he said that he had never before revealed his view as to his duty in case of invasion. The only treason, therefore, of which he was guilty was the treason created by the Act of 1571, a treason which was necessarily involved in his position as a missionary of Rome: it was from one point of view purely spiritual work, while from another it was legal treason.

His fate can hardly be contemplated now without horror and blame, but it is not easy to say on whom the blame lies.

The judges and jury—on the assumption that the evidence was sufficient—could only convict; for the law was clear. The government seems to have been loth to let the law take its extreme course, knowing, of course, that it was difficult to justify it. Yet, on the other hand, it was no doubt politically true that since the bull of deposition every convinced papist was implicitly a traitor; and though he might take advantage for the time of the dispensation and swear allegiance to the queen, he might at any moment be forced to repudiate his oath and side with her enemies. While invading armies were gathering, and Spain and Rome were almost openly preparing invasion, it was almost inevitable that such a position should be regarded as equivalent to actual treason. The burden of blame must mainly rest on the papal policy: the bull had already made it exceedingly difficult to regard a papist as a patriot; while the dispensation which was given in 1580 to profess a temporary loyalty *rebus sic stantibus*—under the existing state of things—soon made it impossible, since by it even the oath of allegiance, which a prisoner might be willing and glad to take, was made to all intents and purposes valueless.

The execution of the law seems to men of our day more

barbarous than it seemed to those who ordered it, carried it out, or underwent it. Mayne was drawn on a hurdle from gaol to the place of execution; from the scaffold he addressed a few words to the crowd, chiefly in order to exonerate, so far as he could, those who had been apprehended with him: more were not allowed him before the hangman did his duty. More fortunate than many and than the sentence intended, he was almost killed by the fall on to the scaffold when the rope was cut, so that in his case the mutilation, disembowelling, and quartering added more of ignominy than of agony. His fate was widely published throughout the kingdom as a terror to others; but, though the timid may have been deterred, the bold were encouraged. A year later John Nelson, the second of the Douai martyrs, was apprehended on December 1, 1578, and after two months' imprisonment was also condemned for treason, and suffered the like penalties at Tyburn. Thomas Sherwood, a student of Douai, who had come over to England on business, followed him four days' later, on February 7, 1578; and thereafter followed a three years' respite.

The development of the organisation of recusancy on the other side of the Channel had the effect of making the southern counties of England almost as recusant as the northern. The bishops in the summer of 1577 were everywhere reporting that papists "do marvellously increase in number and obstinacy." In the diocese of Chichester Bishop Curteys made a vigorous attempt to deal with the chief men, justices and others, who were disaffected, and his list of culprits contains many names that had also been reported at various earlier periods in the reign. He offered them four alternatives—to clear themselves, or to conform, or to "admit conference" with a view to their conformity, or else, if they refused these, to answer certain articles as to their recusancy, their dealings with those abroad, and their possession of contraband literature. His action was very injudicious and his choice of victims very mistaken; complaint was made to the Council, and much personal spite was revealed on both sides, till the dispute almost grew into a *cause célèbre*, and strong personal interest got the bishop reproved. But the reproof did not so much mean that the diocese was free of

Execution of
Mayne,
Nelson, and
Sherwood.

Diocesan
handling of
the recusant
problem.

papists as that their influence both in the county and at the court was considerable.

As imprisonment failed to remedy the evil, the bishops recommended the Council to try what fines would do; they were thereupon desired to send in, with the help of the justices, a return and valuation of all recusants throughout the country. Ultimately nearly 1500 names were reported, but it is evident that the return was not very useful, owing to the unequal way in which it was made by different persons. In some dioceses puritan recusants and "the peevish preciser sort" were returned as well as "papists": in other cases the returns obviously did not represent the facts; they comprised the names of those who had been presented at the bishops' visitations for non-attendance at church, and it was precisely in the most disaffected parts of the country that the fewest were presented. Lancashire and Cheshire contributed only sixty names, but it was admitted that the chief ringleaders were untouched because "they are not presented, though they never attend church and hear mass daily." The Bishop of Peterborough's return reveals the fact that numbers attended church but refused communion—that is to say, they clung to the view that attendance at prayers was not unlawful, although it had been officially condemned.

Sandys sent a painstaking return from York comprehending over 150 persons; it began with a few of the aristocracy, whom some one had had the courage to bring before the ecclesiastical commission, but it ended up with forty women, wives of butchers and the like, in the city of York. His general account, written to accompany the return, is especially descriptive of the state of things. "A more stiff-necked, wilful, or obstinate people did I never know or hear of: doubtless they are reconciled to Rome and sworn to the pope." They will not say *Amen* to the prayer for the queen, they glory in their ignorance of the Bible, they prefer prison to conference with the archbishop. Durham was no better, for Sandys was troubled also with the "massers" whom Barnes was expelling from that diocese. Wales, except the diocese of Llandaff, professed to know nothing of recusancy, although close by in Hereford it was reported with greater candour that "rebellion is rampant, attendance at

Survey and
system of
fines.

The con-
dition of the
north and
west.

church is contemptuous, and John Hareley reads so loud upon his Latin popish primer (that he understands not) that he troubles both minister and people."

The inquiry was specially extended to the Universities and the Inns of Court and of Chancery; Oxford supplied a goodly number of names and much suspicion of concealment; the Inns of Chancery returned twenty-two; ^{The Universities and Inns.} the Inns of Court were found full of backward, suspect, and sequestered men, although constant attempts had been made to purge them, and many had fled to the Jesuits beyond the sea or to Louvain. There can be little doubt that the boast of the Romanists that their cause was reviving was a true one, even though the glowing pictures which were sent over for foreign use to Douai, Rome, or Madrid were considerably over-coloured. The new policy of fines was endorsed by the judges, who declared it to be within the competence of the ecclesiastical commission. A number of recusants, clergy, laity, and importers of "muniments of superstition," were thereupon constantly being arrested, conforming, or else passing more or less rapidly through the prisons; even some of the nuns of Sion, now settled in exile at Mechlin, fell into the Council's hands when they unadvisedly came over to visit their friends; but for the present leniency prevailed.

There were, however, two invading forces in preparation. One was a military expedition, of which Ireland was the objective; it was under the leadership of James Fitzgerald, and was directed also by Dr. Nicholas Sanders as the papal envoy. ^{The attempt on Ireland. 1579.} Spain, which had encouraged its inception, held back as usual when the project neared execution. The invading force consisted principally of some bishops and friars, accompanied by a blessed banner. For a moment the reputation of the attempt attracted the Irish; they had hitherto had little practical experience of the reformed religion, since it could hardly be said to have penetrated beyond the Pale into the Ireland of the Irish: but they had heard enough of it to detest it and to view the invasion with interest. Few, however, rallied to the sacred banner; Fitzgerald was killed at once, while a brief and savage repression dashed all the hopes of the invaders, and left Sanders to perish

miserably of exposure. His loss was a considerable one, for he was one of the ablest of the Romanists abroad, and had done more than any man to foster the English crusade in Rome, Spain, and France; but if he failed as an intriguer he triumphed as a controversialist, for he succeeded by his book, *The English Schism*, in poisoning for a long time the wells of English ecclesiastical history.

The other invading army was more successful. Ever since the Jesuit order had become an effective papal militia, there was talk of its employment in the campaign against England. Already the vague shadow of a Jesuit had flitted across the English field and disappeared; but in 1579, after the Douai offshoot at Rome had been captured by the Society, it was brought more into connexion with English affairs, and soon was prepared to take its share in the mission field as well. Of a handful of Englishmen who had hitherto become Jesuits, two were specially qualified for this task. Parsons and Campion had both been at Oxford, had changed their religion and gone into exile. Parsons, on leaving England in 1574, had almost at once been attracted to the Society. Campion was an older man, had gone to Douai in 1579, and passed on from there to enter the Jesuit Order: he was stationed in Hungary when he was chosen for the mission to England, and was sent to accompany Parsons from Rome in the spring of 1580.

The two men represented two contrasted types: Campion was a single-hearted missionary with a love of souls, Parsons was a born intriguer, with an insatiable greed for statecraft; the first after a very brief career earned his martyrdom; the second, after having a hand in every hostile device against his country, died at last at a great age, worn out, discredited, and baffled. Passing by way of Reims, where the English seminary then was, the party came to the coast and crossed over. Bishop Goldwell, late of St. Asaph, had been sent to take charge of the expedition and to exercise a general oversight of English affairs; but he fell ill, and remained behind at Reims; and thus it came to pass that recusancy was left undirected by any episcopal authority, and the line of the Marian bishops died out. The Council had full information of the invasion, but the disguised Jesuits

The Jesuit
invasion of
England,
June 1580.

Its leaders,
Parsons and
Campion,

eluded the searchers. When they arrived in London they were not made very welcome by their sympathisers, who suspected political action: nor was this unnatural, considering the rumours from abroad and the news about Sanders in Ireland, which was then in all men's mouths.

A formal conference was held, at which the Jesuits, on the authority of their official instructions, protested that they should not handle matters of state: they further declared themselves on the rigorist side in condemning attendance at church and on the lax side in repudiating the old English rules of fasting. The beginnings of the quarrels with the secular priests were thus already present. After the conference Parsons and Campion left London separately: each had drawn up a statement as to their object in coming, which was to be given to the Council or any one else in case of need; Campion's explanation was soon to become historic.

While they went about the country in disguise the Council issued a letter about the non-attendance at church, a proclamation against the harbouring of Jesuits, and various admonitions to sheriffs to arrest the chief offenders. The Council of the North was busy dealing with recusant prisoners; the prisons were filling up, and new ones were being provided. On the other side Campion's paper, injudiciously published by his friends, brought him to the forefront, and soon became widely known, from a disclaimer in it, as "Campion's Brag and Challenge." In the nine articles of which it was composed, he offered to prove the rightfulness of his position to the Council, the theologians, and the lawyers, and defied prisons, torments, and Tyburn. As month after month went by and the Fathers were still at large, and the number of those rallying to them steadily growing, a new literary war began. Charke and Hanmer put forth replies to Campion's *Brag*, which were answered again in their turn, for Parsons got command of a printing-press and issued from it a *Censure* upon the replies to Campion, as well as *A brief discourse*, defending the refusal of church, which he published on his own account under the pseudonym of Howlet. This, in its turn, received hasty replies, and so the paper war went on.

and first
moves.

The counter
moves of
the Council,
and contro-
versialists,

When the search for these men had lasted six months parliament met and passed a new *Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's subjects in their due obedience*. Sir Walter Mildmay's speech upon it, which has been preserved, no doubt reflected the view of the country as a whole, viz., that there were now two parties claiming not only ecclesiastical but civil supremacy in England—the queen on the one side, the Bishop of Rome and his allies on the other; that therefore all who held to the latter repudiated the former, and that the act rightly provided that those who themselves embraced or brought others to embrace “the Romish religion,” as it was now officially called, were simply traitors, and to be treated as such. The act, besides dealing with Jesuits and “seminaries,” enforced also the policy of fines: “massing” was to be punished by fine and prison, recusancy by a penalty of £20 a month; and special attention was paid to schoolmasters, who, of late, had been credited with a good deal of the perversion of the young, and were therefore a special menace to a policy which counted on the dying out of the Marian views. A further act prescribed sharp penalties for slanderous news and seditious libels, of which the Sectaries hereafter were to feel the weight.

The hunt became fiercer and the scent better: both Parsons and Campion had some hair-breadth escapes; numbers of other priests were caught and imprisoned, but the Council kept on releasing and releasing on easy terms all through 1581, so as to distinguish the harmless from the dangerous. Fresh successes on the part of divines in bringing men back to conformity did much to help on the Council's policy. The benefit in some cases was, however, very temporary; some quietly reverted later on, others burnt the fingers of the Council. A great deal was made, for example, of a worthless creature called John Nicholls, who had been in English Orders, fled abroad, abjured and entered the seminary at Rome, returned and was captured in 1581, and then caused great stir by recanting. He was speedily utilised to preach to the recusant prisoners; a pension was raised for him by the bishops, the press was put at his service, and he printed some scurrilous attacks on his late friends,

Ending in
fresh legisla-
tion in parlia-
ment, Jan. 16-
March 18,
1581.

The methods
of the
government.

which were answered and became the starting-point of a dreary course of controversy. It was soon broken by another flight abroad and another recantation on the part of Nicholls in 1582, and in the next year his troublous career ended. He was not a favourable specimen of the government's agents; but there were many worse and more unprincipled than he, spying out secrets abroad or hunting down recusants at home.

In the autumn of 1580 much suspicion had fallen on Berkshire and Oxfordshire; searches, apprehensions, and trials had been going on, Campion's tracks had been found in Bucks, and Sir George Peckham, one of his harbourers, had been sent to the Marshalsea, ^{Minor captures lead up to} where he remained until he conformed and was sent out on bail. Ralph Sherwin, who had come from the seminary at Rome as chaplain to Bishop Goldwell, and, leaving his master behind, had recently made his way to England, was taken in November and sent to the Marshalsea; Hart and Bosgrave followed him thither, and in December all three were removed to the Tower, where they had to submit to conferences intended to convert, as well as to tortures intended to extort information. The chase became hotter when the bookbinder of the vagrant press in Oxfordshire was caught; this was followed in April by the capture of Alexander Briant, who was in close touch with Parsons, and he was sent to share the trials of the Tower. Their racking and torture coincided, strangely enough, with a great releasing of recusant prisoners in general.

At last Campion was run to earth at Lyford, was brought up to London with three other priests and lodged in the Tower. It was a grand triumph for the government to be able to confront him with his *Brag* and his book, and to bring up its best controversialists to take turns at him with the torture-master. ^{the apprehension of Campion, July 1581, torture, and disputations.} The country was widely ransacked for evidence against him, while Lady Stonor's woods were searched for the printing-press; much of this zeal was directed by the confessions which, as was alleged and is probable, were extorted from him by the rack. The full-dress disputations began at the end of August. Both in these and in his trial Campion personally attracted all men's admiration: he was

an attractive personality, a powerful speaker, and enough of a scholar to write, in his *Decem rationes*, a defence of his challenge which could give plenty of occupation to the enemy. Consequently, after three bouts of disputation, it was found by the government that all hopes of a victory were gone, and that their prisoner was gaining credit, consideration, and pity, rather than discredit and confusion.

So the next move was to the law-court. The prosecution came to it at a disadvantage: Campion had been the one of all the invaders whom the authorities had most sought to capture; but, once fallen into their hands, he proved more of a difficulty than an acquisition, since all their inquiries failed to produce any evidence against him of actual treason. He had in his examination acknowledged the queen as his lawful sovereign; but such an acknowledgment was now valueless, since the new dispensation of the pope allowed the oath for the present, *i.e.* until such time as it was convenient to disown it. When pressed further he refused to disavow the bull of deposition or repudiate the pope's action in excommunicating the queen. This line was followed by most of his companions, but two declared that they would not give up their allegiance at the pope's bidding, and thus put themselves in a position of established loyalty. The rest were entangled in treason—if not actual aggressive acts, at least the legal treason created by the penal acts which had recently sent another priest named Everard Hanse to the gallows. It was on this broad general ground rather than on specific evidence, in the modern sense of the term, that the jury brought in the verdict of guilty, which was a foregone conclusion and a political necessity.

Two whole batches of fifteen prisoners were now condemned, one had been acquitted. Campion was chosen out, with Briant and Sherwin, two seminary priests, to suffer first. Their execution, on December 1, 1581, evoked a storm of protest; this was partly due to Campion's reputation, partly to the notorious partiality of the trial, and partly to the fact that it raised in an acute form the question whether these men were put to death for religion or for treason—a question which was discussed all over Europe, and in which leaders such as Allen on the one side

and Burghley on the other took their share. Meanwhile the executions went on: seven of Campion's associates in the trials were executed in May 1582; while the two who had established their loyalty and two others were respited, released in 1585, and banished. Four more put to death in this year brought up to eighteen the number of priests executed since the capture of Mayne. The authorities, meanwhile, had learnt prudence, and the treason charged against the later victims was the breaking of the act of parliament, not any actual participation in plots. The year 1583 brought four executions, two of laymen; and year by year the terrible list lengthened, till it included by the end of the reign 124 of the clergy and 63 men and women of the laity.

Was it treason or religion for which they suffered? Taking the case at its strongest,—*e.g.* taking Campion as example—it seems easy to argue that it was for religion, and hard to deny it. It would not be so easy in the case of Parsons or Sanders; but Sanders was dead and Parsons had fled. In respect of actual active treason there was all the difference in the world between one and another. At the same time the government had defined the propagation of Romanism to be treason; and it had this amount of justification for passing such an act and for enforcing it in certain cases, that the views which these men were all alike propagating were views which, unrepressed, would have made England a theatre of bloodshed like France and the Netherlands, and possibly a province of the world-wide Spanish empire. In this generation it requires a considerable effort of historical imagination to realise adequately how overwhelming those dangers were.

The question whether they died for religion or for policy is best answered indirectly. They died for the deposing power of the pope; other recusant opinions would no doubt have got them into much trouble, but it was the refusal to repudiate this claim which brought them to the gallows. If, therefore, this claim is part of the Christian religion, then certainly it was for the Christian religion that they died; but if it was a mistaken legacy of medieval papal statecraft, then they died for a mistake, and were the victims rather of their own party than of their foes.

How far
were they
justified?

AUTHORITIES.—The *Privy Council Acts* give much information. For Douai see *Records of Eng. Cath. u.s.* For the London printer see Strype, *Aylmer*. For Mayne see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; Challoner *Memoirs*; *S.P. Dom.* cxviii. 46, 47; Morris, *Trials of our Catholic Forefathers*, i. For the dealings of Bishop Curteys and other diocesans see *S.P. Dom.* cxl.-cxiv., and for the episcopal return of recusants, *S.P. Dom.* cxvi. 15, cxvii.-cxix., cxxii. 28, 31. For Campion see Simpson, *Life of Campion*, which is illuminating, and cp. Taunton, *History of the Jesuits in England*, especially for Parsons. For the action of the Council of the North see a full return in *S.P. Dom.* cxli. 3, 28. The *State Papers* are full of the dealings with recusancy; a number are printed in *Jesuits in Conflict*. The papal dispensation is in Tierney's edition of Dodd, *History of England* (Appendix).

CHAPTER XIII

THE EARLY DEALINGS OF WHITGIFT WITH PURITANISM

WHEN Whitgift became archbishop of Canterbury, the whole position of ecclesiastical affairs altered. Grindal's days had been a time of paralysis: not only was he himself disinclined to proceed strongly against disloyal puritanism, but his disgrace robbed him of whatever effectiveness he might otherwise have had. Consequently the enemies of the Church multiplied apace both within and without: the danger from recusancy and nonconformity advanced by great stages; and, when the archbishop's death cut short the protracted negotiation for his resignation, there was much need of a vigorous ruler.

Whitgift stood out conspicuously above all the rest of the bishops, and his succession to the vacant place was unquestionable. He had long distinguished himself by his vigorous and uncompromising churchmanship: in his Cambridge days he had been the chief opponent of Cartwright and his party: since then he had been the official respondent to the *Admonitions*, and the apologist of the episcopate against its critics in the House of Commons. Further, for the last six years his energy had been shown not only in governing the diocese of Worcester, but also in much ecclesiastical work within other dioceses of the West, where the mending of disputes and the introduction of reforms had been laid upon him as being the man most obviously capable of doing it. At Lichfield, for example, he had been mainly concerned with the incompetence of the clergy and with the unpopularity of Overton, the bishop, who

The position
at Grindal's
death, 1583.

The antecedents of
John Whitgift,
1530?-1604.

was quarrelsome and avaricious, while the repression of recusancy and similar needs of the diocese, which was one of the most troublesome, did not come within his province. At Hereford he had to deal only with the cathedral. A careful scrutiny which he made of the state of the Church revealed his minute carefulness, but detected no great abuses, so his chief duty was to provide a new set of statutes. He was decidedly in sympathy with the Calvinists in his doctrinal standpoint, and in this respect he joined hands with the puritan party and with other sections of English churchmen, who were more anxious than he to see such views triumph over those of the existing formularies. The present conflict, however, was not doctrinal but disciplinary, and in this field the new archbishop was a convinced opponent of the Swiss tenets. Episcopacy was with him, as with Parker, a matter of principle, not, as with Grindal and others of the exilic bishops, a mere matter of policy. His insistence in his reply to the *Admonitions* on the divine origin of the episcopal authority, against the theory that it was an emanation from the royal power, had already attracted adverse attention, and made many suspicious of what was coming.

He was not slow to show his hand: the confirmation of his election took place at the end of September, and within a month he had issued the celebrated articles, which ^{His first action, 1583.} began the storm. In conjunction with six other bishops of the province, he drafted his scheme of reform, and presented it to the queen for her authorisation. In the course of its formulation the scheme took several shapes, whose inner relation to one another it is a little difficult to decide; suffice it to state that, whether in the form of fifteen articles, as presented to the queen by the Archbishop and the Bishop of Salisbury, or of the twelve recorded in Whitgift's register with nine episcopal signatures, or in the shorter form in which it underwent the criticisms of some of its adversaries, it was sure to excite violent opposition. The letter of October 19 which issued it, besides giving further instructions as to the procedure against recusants, called for a return of the clergy of the province, with a report as to their conformity. Thus the new campaign was opened, and a long and bitter conflict was begun.

The enemy which Whitgift thus intrepidly attacked was both organised and highly favoured. Ever since the day twelve years before when the first presbytery was established at Wandsworth, there had been going on a steady growth of constructive presbyterianism. ^{The policy of puritanism}

The *Admonitions* had given the movement heart, the *Book of Discipline* had given it method; the last two years had witnessed more rapid developments. Concerted action and organisation had made great progress in London especially and in the Midlands: the old London meetings that had formerly fulminated against the habits and the prayer-book now again took the offensive, and, after deciding that the episcopal government was anti-christian, set to work for the substitution of the presbyterian system. Sixty ministers out of the eastern counties met at Cockfield in Suffolk on May 16, 1582, to organise resistance to the prayer-book; and a start was made with regular periodical meetings in the same interest at the universities.

Shortly before Grindal's death a formal assembly drew up a series of decrees, foreseeing the change that was imminent and anxious to have a clear programme. Here the new hierarchy is clearly in evidence: there is a ^{is completed and enforced.} "classis" in each cure, which is to call the minister, to decide as to the omission of the ceremonies of the prayer-book, to transform quietly the churchwardens and collectors into "elders" and "deacons"; above these "classes" there are other assemblies in ascending gradation—provincial, comital, and national, the comital being concurrent with the "commencements" at the universities, and the national with the parliament. This organisation was already busy in its various ways: it had to exercise the Holy Discipline over all the godly, and even such a ringleader as Wilcox, one of the heroes of the first *Admonition*, was made to feel the impartiality of its censures. It was also taking an intrusive part in the making of ministers: episcopal ordination was to be undergone merely as a civil requirement: one so ordained had to renounce that calling and take a new calling from the approbation of the classis; a man, however, who received his first calling from the presbytery was allowed to submit himself *pro forma* to the bishop's hands. A similar

interference was prescribed at entrance upon a benefice. A body that adopted such a revolutionary policy as this might naturally be expected to sit loosely to the prayer-book: and in fact it had long ceased to use it in the way which the law required. When it professed to use the book, all that was implied was this, that the minister read some extracts from the services,—it might be the psalms of the day and the two lessons,—as a necessary prelude to going into the pulpit, there to begin the extempore prayer and sermon which formed the main part of the service. Many, however, made no pretence of using it at all; and, relying on the approval of their assembly, conducted their Sunday service entirely independently of it.

Such a policy on the part of the clergy was wholly indefensible. But when such a position is taken up by a number of earnest and honest men, it is well to

How far was
it justifiable?

see what excuses there are to be made for them.

It must be remembered that they in conscience regarded the existing state of things as contrary to the divine law: further, that they did not regard secession as a lawful alternative open to them; and that therefore they had no alternative but to stay where they were and work for a change. And, if it be thought that their method was unsatisfactory, it must at the same time be borne in mind that they were making all sorts of constitutional attempts at redress for their grievances, only to find themselves paralysed at every point, to some extent by the *non possumus* of the bishops, but far more whole-heartedly and far more invincibly by the unyielding veto of the queen.

Besides being highly organised, the Puritans were also highly favoured. For a long time they had possessed not

Support for
it in high
places.

merely the sympathy but the active support of a number of those who were chief in Elizabeth's counsels. Leicester was openly known as their protector; Knollys was, if less actively, probably more convincingly on their side: and others, who were in general less friendly and who in theory would have wished to enforce the political uniformity, were very ready to intercede or plead privilege for a friend. It would need all the intrepidity of Whitgift and all the support of the queen to meet such a phalanx without defeat.

The change of primate called for a new ecclesiastical commission, and it was natural that those who could forecast what an engine that was likely to prove in the new archbishop's hand should make an attempt to prevent the renewal. It was unsuccessful: Whitgift sent to Burghley a series of eleven arguments to show the absolute necessity of it for the general conduct of the discipline of the Church as well as for dealing with "disordered persons commonly called puritans"; and the commission was issued in the beginning of December, in the same form as that used at the beginning of Grindal's primacy.

Before that time the fight was already raging hotly: from the early days of November protests against the archbishop's articles had begun to pour in. There was much in them that the Puritans disliked, though little that was new. The habits, the forbidding of private services, the insistence that all who officiate must also read the service and minister the sacraments according to the forms of the prayer-book four times in the year—such things as these more than outweighed in their eyes the accompanying grant of a few reforms such as they desired. But their chief hostility was reserved for the subscription demanded. This again was no new thing; the three points to which it applied were the same three as had been in question in Parker's day—the Supremacy, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Book of Common Prayer,—but the last had now become far more odious, and many ministers had ceased even to think of either using or justifying it. To declare now that it contained nothing contrary to the Word of God was more than they could find it in their conscience to do.

From all parts of the province came distressed cries of clergy threatened with deprivation if they would not subscribe. The Council attempted to create a diversion by calling on the archbishop to deal with a list of ten needed reforms, among which there was no reference to non-conforming or non-subscribing ministers. This, however, only revealed the fine metal of which the primate was made. He pursued his course unswerving, and only took a convenient occasion, when it suited him, to issue to the province the order for the reforms demanded by the

Renewal of
the ecclesiastical
commission, Dec.
9, 1583.

Rebellion
against the
archbishop's
articles.

His dealings
with the
Council,
Nov. 1583,

Council in addition to his own previous orders. The scene of the wailings now shifted from the various dioceses to London. Kent, the archbishop's own county, Sussex, Cambridgeshire, Lincolnshire, Suffolk, and Essex were among those which revealed or sent up companies of protesting ministers. Those from Sussex were interviewed by him at the beginning of December; and, having had their scruples removed by his explanations, they subscribed and went in peace. His own Kentish men proved more obdurate, and went home unconvinced. To back their protest, made in the early part of the new year, they made interest with the Council, and an expostulation went out from the Board to Whitgift, bringing their petition and a similar one from Suffolk to his notice, and asking him to come to its next meeting on the following Sunday. In reply to the Suffolk petition he expressed to the councillors his surprise at this irregular way of dealing with a case from one of his suffragans; he sent them the diocesan bishop's account of the matter, accounting that in itself sufficient, but adding a trenchant reply of his own. As to the sixteen from his own diocese, "most of them unlearned and young, and such as he would be loath to admit to the ministry," who had come to him unbidden and argued for two days and a half, he would not relent; on the contrary, he plainly resented the encouragement that the councillors were giving to an insignificant and disorderly minority. In conclusion, reminding them that he was the pastor appointed over them in matters pertaining to the soul, he called on them to second his efforts, and declined to attend their meeting. Here was a prelate truly who must be reckoned with.

In March 1584 a score of the gentry of Kent took up the cause; and, after sending a written protest, had an interview with the primate. They took the same ^{and with the laity.} line as the rest in asking allowance for godly men, who only quarrelled for conscience' sake with some parts of the prayer-book. But Whitgift had a conscience too, though puritans characteristically could not conceive the fact, and to connive at rebellion was a thing which he could not reconcile with it. Moreover, even if it had been in his eyes a mere matter of policy, it was not much more likely that he would give in, seeing that at this very juncture a new

edition of the *Book of Discipline* was found to be in hand, and was discovered and suppressed at Cambridge. The message from the Council led to a fresh interview, which must have been quite as heated as those with the ministers; for Robert Beale, the clerk of the Council, thereupon began to resort to Lambeth, and expressed his views to the archbishop in a violent book and unmeasured words. The attack deserves notice, not for its main method, which was of the usual sort, nor for its personalities, but because Beale produced some legal arguments which were unusual and interesting. In particular, he carried on the reproach which the early Puritans had already raised, that the bishops had no right to press for this measure of conformity, since they themselves did not observe the ornaments' rubric. To this Whitgift had no reply; the meaning of the rubric was hidden behind the traditions created by disuse and the policy enforced through the Advertisements, and the archbishop himself had never even seen a copy of the Edwardine book.

The Council continued to intervene in favour of its petitioners, and in deference to it the archbishop mitigated his sentences and forbore deprivation; but the commission went on with its work, and soon evoked a protest even from Burghley, who, though his private sympathies were puritan, was as a statesman
Burghley's strictures on the methods of the eccl. commission,
 Whitgift's best supporter at the Council board. Two curates from Cambridgeshire had made their moan to him, and showed him a set of twenty-four articles which they had been called upon by the commission to answer on their oaths. This document seemed to the Treasurer to be "formed in a Romish style," and the method "too much savouring the Romish Inquisition." Even though it might be defended by the canonists, he did not think it expedient. In point of fact, the first six articles were the questions which were now being put to all in that court in order to establish the grounds of action; the rest were particular questions drawn in order to make the respondent incriminate himself on oath upon charges which had privately been laid or were merely suspected against him. This oath to answer interrogatories administered by the judge merely in virtue of his office, apart from formal accusation or presentment, is the famous *ex officio* oath round

which henceforward a hot fight raged. It was no new thing itself, for it was in some shape the custom of other courts, and it had been part of the methods laid down for the ecclesiastical commission ever since its first patent. Nor was the protest against it new, for it had been begun by the Jesuits and seminary priests. The Puritans had borrowed it from them, and it had been raised in a notable case in Grindal's time—that of Wright, who was convented in 1582 for taking upon himself to minister, having only received presbyterian orders at Antwerp. But it now became one of the staple points of the puritan rebellion.

The archbishop's answer to the lord treasurer was a strong one. He pointed out that his facts were wrong, his epithets were undeserved, his *protégés* were not the injured innocents represented; the articles were in strict accordance with law and precedent; they were only propounded to men already accused, and to them only after attempts had been made to satisfy their scruples by conference. Even if they were to bring odium and the nicknames of "tyrant, pope, knave," the primate protested that he would not be deterred from his duty. A bit of warm correspondence followed, but Burghley saw that he was bound to support the primate's action. The outcry, though loud, came from but a few; indeed, only 50 refused out of over 800 preachers in eleven of the dioceses for which a return was made. Soon the scene of battle was shifted from Lambeth to Westminster.

The new parliament spent a very active time for one month at the end of 1584, and two months in the following February and March; but the net result of its activity was not large. An "Act against Jesuits, The new parliament, Nov. 23, 1584, to March 29, 1585. seminary priests, and other such like disobedient persons" decreed their banishment from the country, unless they would take the oath of supremacy, and if they remained, adjudged them guilty of treason, and their abettors guilty of felony. An "Act to ensure the queen's safety" and the peace of the realm was the sole measure of present interest that found its way into the statute-book: the real ecclesiastical significance of the parliament centred round its abortive efforts. Proposals to secure a stricter observance of "the

Sabbath" were in dispute all through the sessions, and, when at last, after much debate and conference, a measure was passed on which both the Houses could agree, the queen refused her assent.

More important still were the wider proposals for the reform of religion. The contest on ecclesiastical matters between the Commons and the royal prerogative advanced a stage further. The end of the first part of the sessions was taken up with the old conflict: petitions were presented in favour of the deprived preachers, and one Dr. Turner "put the House in remembrance of the bill and book heretofore offered by him to the said House." The bill no doubt expressed the views on church reform of the godly ministers who had drawn it up, and the Book was the Genevan book, which they wished to authorise in place of, or in addition to, the prayer-book. These documents were not read, but some action was taken on the petitions: a committee digested them into sixteen articles, which were presented to the Lords with a view to joint action. The peers made light of them, as being only sent in from three counties; and, reminding the committee of the snub received from the Crown on the former occasion when such an attempt to handle church matters was made, left it to the Council to ascertain the queen's mind before proceeding further.

The matter, however, by no means ended there. When parliament reassembled in the beginning of February, public feeling had been stirred by the issue of an appeal to parliament called *A lamentable complaint of the Commonaltie . . . for a learned Ministerie*; petitions were presented from fresh parts of the country with a complaint of disorders in the bishops' ministry; and these came to a reading. Further action was postponed until the Lords could be consulted, and was delayed by them because they were at the time a little affronted about another affair which was occupying the attention of the two Houses; but a week later Burghley and Whitgift came out of the House to meet the committee of the Commons, and gave them such an overpowering reply that both Sir Francis Knollys and Sir Walter Mildmay, who were in charge of the petitions, went

Attempts at
fresh inter-
ference with
ecclesiastical
affairs.

The Lords
resist them,

away aghast, and protested, in reporting the result to the Lower House, that they could give no proper account of it till the committee had had time to confer and produce a report of it jointly.

The reply was delivered by the archbishop *ex tempore*, but he held meanwhile in his hand an official document on which it was based, and one which is of some historical importance. Convocation had not been wasting its opportunities, but, on the day after the first petitions appeared in the Commons, a series of articles drawn up there by the bishops had been presented to the queen as a fresh scheme of reform; the greater part of it was a repetition of five of the articles issued by Whitgift in 1583, but some additions were made to them, and two new articles were added to restrain abuses in excommunication and in pluralities. Thus when the time came for the primate to answer the sixteen grievances of the Commons, he could point triumphantly to the fact that some of them had already been met by the articles which the Puritans so greatly abused, as well as by the official action of the bishops, whose ineffectiveness they so loudly denounced. As for the complaints not touched by the episcopal scheme, the bishops were not prepared to give way at all. Whitgift, in his official reply to the committee as well as in his documentary answer, and other bishops as well in similar terms, made it clear that they had gone as far as they meant to go. Abuses in the matters of ordination, of dispensations, of penance and excommunication they were already dealing with; but they would not hear of such novelties as the exempting of ministers from the obligation of conformity, or from subscription, nor of such attempts to introduce stealthily parts of the Genevan platform, as a requirement that six ministers should take part in every ordination of a priest and in signing his letters of orders, or that every parish should have a right of objecting to the patron's nominee to the cure.

The queen, as before, resented the action of parliament and supported the bishops. She blamed them for some defects in their government when convocation came two days later to present its subsidy, but said that she would not suffer the reproachful speeches of the Nether House, nor that they should meddle with

and Whitgift
gives a new
reply, Feb.
25, 1585.

The queen
supports the
bishops in
the main.

matters above their capacity not pertaining to them. The bishops' articles were expanded slightly, and formally passed as canons at the end of March; they then, with the exception of one clause, which seemed to give the bishops too absolute a right to refuse institution to the patron's presentee, received the approval of the Crown and were formally promulgated. The Commons, resenting more than ever their rebuff, went on devising abortive ecclesiastical reforms of their own: their closing days were spent over bills to abolish marriage licenses, to restrict excommunication, and, in short, to carry out the proposed innovations. Two such measures actually got so far as to the Upper House—one designed to abolish the old restriction as to the seasons for marriage, the other to remedy the disorders of ministers. A protest from the primate against these and others like them went up to the queen only four days before the prorogation, with the result that in her speech on that occasion, March 29, 1585, she reasserted that the duty lay on her to see that faults in the order of the clergy were amended. She added at the same time an imperious warning to the bishops that if they did not amend matters she would depose them—a warning, no doubt, much needed in some dioceses where the primate's reforms had so far been a dead letter.

There followed a brief interval before the struggle between royal and parliamentary supremacy was renewed. Some attempts were made by the ecclesiastical authorities to meet the grievances of their enemies; for example, by order of convocation on March 31, 1585, the prophesyings were restored again, or further developed under careful restrictions, and the bishops were busy with this remedy for an unlearned and an unpreaching ministry as well as with the enforcement of their new reforming code of canons. But their efforts were not likely to appease the complaints, partly because nothing short of an entire subversion of the whole constitution of the Church would have satisfied the malcontents, and partly because the bishops, with a few exceptions, were men of such indifferent or squalid reputation that they would necessarily have failed to commend even the best of causes. The more capable prelates were only incurring greater odium through trying to do their duty by the discipline of the Church in face of the lawlessness of

the new disciplinarians. Whitgift, after his first show of severity, was content to deal more mildly, and not to force the consciences of men already in possession of cures, who gave signs of a tolerable degree of conformity. But with men like Wigginton, who persisted in preaching without license, or leaders of the presbyterian movement like Gellibrand or Walward, who could not refrain from open abuse of the constitution of the Church, he dealt strictly, even to imprisonment and deprivation. The ecclesiastical commission was busy in London, while Archbishop Sandys and his colleagues were bearing their part in a special ecclesiastical commission in the northern province; its methods were drastic, and there was the continual struggle over the method of procedure by oath *ex officio*; but its justice was tempered by mercy. Moreover, the people rebelled against the tyranny of the puritan ministers. For example, when John Udall began to put the Discipline into operation at Kingston-on-Thames, his parishioners delated him to the commission. On his refusal to answer upon oath as to his doctrine he was suspended and imprisoned; but release and restoration were soon granted him. In the autumn of 1586 he was again in trouble; the commissioners went a long way to meet his scruples and bore patiently with his lectures: eventually his own admissions were enough to condemn him, but after a strong warning not to speak against the established order he was let go. Escaping thus a second time, he went off and subscribed the Book of Discipline, and prepared the way for the Marprelate tracts by collecting materials for an attack upon the bishops, and by establishing a secret printing-press, from which he issued two little revolutionary treatises of his own. This led to his being suspended and deprived of his benefice, whereupon he began a year's career as an ecclesiastical marauder upon the Scottish Border. Udall was not the only one of the Puritans who was generously treated, nor the only one to show himself the more intractable thereafter.

The repression of nonconformity was not left solely to the bishops; the judges bore their part in the assize courts, and were even more severe in dealing with the aberrations of puritan ministers from the prayer-book. But the dealing with individuals was of little use,

seconded by
the judges.

and even the tuning of pulpits was inefficient so long as the printing-press disseminated the seeds of the presbyterian revolution.

The closing of the press to papists had no doubt done much to spoil their propaganda, though even the most active supervision did not succeed in keeping out the infection from abroad. It was naturally hoped that by similar strictness the puritan propaganda might be confined within limits. In 1583 the ecclesiastical commission, at the bidding of the privy council, restricted the London presses, suppressed illicit ones, and issued orders to regulate printing. Further orders were made by the Star Chamber in 1584. And finally, by an order of the privy council in the Star Chamber, on June 23, 1586, presses were allowed to be in use only in London, except one at each of the universities; every press was to be licensed and to be subject to inspection, and was to print no book without an official *imprimatur*, such as had been already ordered ever since the royal articles of 1559. The futility of this attempt will very soon be seen; for Waldegrave the printer, who, in May 1588, was the victim of this order, and suffered the destruction of his press and his work for having attempted to issue Udall's *Diotrephes*, became forthwith the hero of the secret press which printed not only Udall's *Diotrephes* and *Demonstration of Discipline*, but also the early Marprelate tracts.

Among the most conspicuous men at whom a blow was struck was Travers, who had made his reputation long ago as author of the *Book of Discipline*. Of late he had preached at the Temple as afternoon lecturer, and at the death of Dr. Alvey in 1584 his succession to the mastership seemed to his admirers the natural reward of his eminence. Whitgift raised objection to him as an innovator who had received only presbyterian orders, and after some delay the new master was found in Richard Hooker. He came from the obscurity of a country parish, to which an ill-advised marriage had banished him just when Oxford laurels were thick upon him; and few, if any, as yet could divine in him the fair blossom of the English reformation. His education he largely owed to Bishop Jewel, who secured a place for him at Oxford at the age of fourteen, in 1568. His remove

Restriction
of the press.

The dispute
of Hooker
with Travers,
1584:

to London obliged him to take up the puritan controversy at the point where Whitgift had left it after his duel with Cartwright about the *Admonitions*. He thus became the successor of both Jewel and Whitgift; and his own *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which grew out of the polemics at the Temple, was to form the third and the superlative Elizabethan apologia of the English Church.

The first move of Travers was a proposal that the new master should defer preaching until he had received his call from the congregation. Hooker declined this suggestion, and its progress, equally refused to countenance the discouragement of kneeling at worship, the attempt to turn sidesmen into elders, and other planks of the new platform. Thereupon the divergence of views became more and more marked till "the forenoon sermon spake Canterbury and the afternoon Geneva." After a year Travers' attack became more definite, and Whitgift intervened and silenced him, nor could a supplication addressed to the privy council, and backed by much interest, secure his restoration. The dispute had been conducted with dignity and charity and mutual respect. If there had been hope of a pacific end to it, there might have been hope also of the like end for the general controversy of which it was the most favourable example. But there were no terms possible in either case; nothing could combine presbyterian and episcopal views, or reconcile the novelties of puritanism with the historic constitution of the Church. So the great talents and worth of Travers were transferred to the new foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, where his want of episcopal orders was no disqualification for a scholastic position.

Soon the yet more distinguished qualities of Hooker reverted to the retirement and solitude of a country parish, where the points at issue could be pondered at and result. leisure, and Hooker's verdict upon them could be set forth in the majestic *Ecclesiastical Polity*. The first four books laid the foundations solidly in 1594; of the four that were to follow Hooker lived to issue only one, the fifth book and central section of his work, in 1597; the rest were published in an inchoate form after his death in 1600.

AUTHORITIES.—Whitgift's visitation of Hereford is recorded in *S.P. Dom.* clx. 16. His articles of 1583 are in *S.P. Dom.* clxiii. 31, and printed in

Selborne, *Liturgy of Engl. Ch.* Cp. *Doc. Ann.* and *Part of a Register*. For the history of puritanism Bancroft's *Dangerous Positions* begins to be of value. Strype, Brook, and Fuller, *Church Hist.*, contain valuable documents as to the contest with Whitgift. Cp. *S.P. Dom.* clxiii. 68; clxiv. 11; clxix. 12; and Bodley's Libr. MS. Tanner 280, which contains many documents as to the reform of ecclesiastical abuses. Valuable documents as to parliament in 1585 are in *S.P. Dom.* clxxv.-clxxvii. A specimen of the dealings with the Puritans by judges of assize is in *S.P. Dom.* clxi. 33. For the exercises of "the unlearneder sort of the ministry" see Gorham, *Reformation Gleanings*, Nos. clxxxiv.-clxxxvi. For the restriction of the press see *S.P. Dom.* clxi. and clxxi. 48. Udall's *Diotrephes* and *Demonstration of Discipline* have been reprinted by Arber. For Hooker see *Works* with *Introduction* by Bishop Paget; also Walton, *Life of Hooker*.

CHAPTER XIV

BEFORE THE ARMADA

WHILE the dealings with the Puritans were thus progressing quietly, England was in a ferment from other causes. Ever since the execution of Campion in 1581 the danger from the romanist party had been steadily on the increase. His death was hailed as a martyrdom, and the fame of it spreading abroad, provoked a war of books and pamphlets in which the action of the English Crown was hotly attacked and hotly defended. The attack was led by Allen from abroad, though even at home little pamphlets struggled into print to glorify Campion's martyrdom and vilify the government. The defence was undertaken by no less a person than Burghley himself. Along with the cry that the priests had suffered for religion, and not for treason, there was also a protest against the cruelty to prisoners and the torture which had "pulled Briant a foot longer than God made him."

The ferment
following on
Campion's
death.

At first it was apparently intended to issue an official declaration of the queen's policy, like that which had gone forth after the rebellion in the north in 1570. The convincing argument in it was to be the fact that those who had given satisfactory replies as to loyalty had not been executed. This official intention was, however, dropped, and Burghley unofficially and anonymously put forth the reply in two pamphlets. The chief of the two—*The Execution of Justice in England*—reviewed the history of the dealings with recusants through the reign, noted the clemency shown to Marian bishops, the twelve years of leniency up to Felton's execution, the queen's repeated assurance that she would not

Official and
semi-official
defences.

press consciences but only take account of overt acts, and showed the countless ways in which, through that principle, known recusants had enjoyed immunities. All this was effectively contrasted with the pope's dealings—his encouragement of rebellion through Morton and Sanders, his double-dealing in the faculties granted to the Jesuits in 1580—and with the seditious results that had followed. Burghley cautiously confined himself to the capital charge, and said nothing of the persecution effected by fine and imprisonment. The complaints about torture, however grave they sound in modern ears, sounded somewhat false then, especially from such lips. Norton, the rack-master, replied to them that he had not gone beyond the orders of the privy council, to which, acting in the queen's name, the authority to order torture was strictly confined; while the councillors were prepared to justify it by the plea of political necessity—a plea which, if established, would carry with it the assent of the general political conscience of the time. Allen replied to the pamphlets, and Bilson wrote his voluminous rejoinder on the whole relation of Crown and religion, called *The true Difference between Christian Subjection and Un-Christian Rebellion*; and so the paper war went on.

While underneath the surface Allen and Parsons plotted abroad, the recusant clergy in England were more occupied with spiritual work. The catechism printed abroad by Lawrence Vaux in 1580, and disseminated so rapidly in England that in a few months it was out of print, stands forth in welcome relief against the darker background of controversy and the black darkness of plots and attempted assassinations. In its simple instructions on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Commandments, and the sacraments and ceremonies of the Church, it has an evident kinship with the rival document of that name, and is representative of the truest work of the seminary priests who took their lives in their hands in order to minister to their fellow-recusants in isolation and persecution, or to bring over to their own belief those who through lack of it seemed to them in imminent danger of perdition. Their labours and sufferings produced much fruit. In many parts of the country, and especially in Hampshire and Sussex on the south coast, in celtic

The religious
work of the
Recusants
progresses,

Wales, and in the conservative north, there was much tenacity as to the old ways, and people were very ready to welcome any one who would support them in it. Elsewhere the prevailing irreligion or the narrow and negative zeal of puritanism had disgusted others who had at first embraced the reforms, and was disposing them to return from a change which proved so disappointing; for, however much the Puritans might writhe under the charge, it was true that, from the point of view of the government, puritanism was worse than papistry. This encouraged but one form of recusancy, while that tended to multiply it in two directions by creating popish as well as protestant recusants.

If Romanism could have remained loyal its power would have been far greater. Plain country gentlemen are swayed by prejudice rather than by theological argument. Their prejudice might, for either one or other of the reasons already mentioned, be in favour of the medieval ways; and, so long as they had to do with men like Vaux and the bulk of the seminary priests, they might prefer the familiar Latin mass, with all its perils, to the security of a dull morning prayer or a dreary homily at their parish church. But when questions of politics inevitably came in, and it was even hinted that their religion should be secured to them through the conquest of England by the Spaniard, or by the assassination of Elizabeth and the substitution of Mary of Scotland, the matter assumed a very different aspect in their eyes. Great, therefore, as was the growth of recusancy at this time, and greater still the number of men well disposed to a return to the Marian position, it was a perpetual miscalculation when the leaders of rebellion, either at home or abroad, thought that they could count upon large support. The men who would go a long way to welcome the non-political recusant recoiled from the political intriguer; and it became increasingly clear that the papacy, by attempting to recover England through foul means, had forfeited the chance of doing so by fair ones.

Unfortunately the record of treason and plot must take a place disproportionate to its real magnitude in the pages of the historian; and the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign supply material of this sort for many more pages than can

be devoted to the subject. After the executions of 1581 and 1582 the government was slow and very careful in its dealings. Even with a priest like John Chapman, who refused to allow the queen's supremacy, and stoutly maintained the pope's authority, it did not proceed to extremities; while an oath of allegiance was framed which suspect priests could and did take, though it repudiated the bull of excommunication and the deposing power of the pope. Priest after priest thus passed through the hands of the government only to be set at liberty.

But with the coming of Holt the Jesuit to Scotland the intrigues round Mary began to develop further. In 1583 the invasion of England was being planned simultaneously in Paris and under the influence of Philip and the Jesuits; and nothing but the rivalry of France and Spain averted the blow. Three sets of conspirators were competing for the honour of assassinating the queen. The home-grown attempt failed the most conspicuously, for Somerville, the principal actor in it, was a poor creature inflamed by a seditious priest to an ill-conceived plot which landed him in the Tower and the suicide's grave, in October 1583, before it had any chance of realisation. The Paris schemes were more serious; and when, a month later, Francis Throgmorton was taken, and under the sore persuasion of the rack yielded up the secrets of Mary and the Guises, with the plots of Spain, Rome, and the English exiles, there were many that fled, many that were imprisoned, and many more still that trembled either for their queen and their country or else for themselves. The Spanish ambassador was summarily dismissed; Arundel, Northumberland, and the chief conspirators were sent to the Tower; the prisons were filled with recusants, both clergy and laity. But the heaviest vengeance fell on a heterogeneous collection of five priests who were executed together at Tyburn on February 12, 1584. Most of them had been some time in one or other prison; two at least had been so ever since they had landed in England from abroad, two years or so previously. The suggestion that they had plotted the queen's death was ridiculous. Their crime was that they had received ordination abroad; their misfortune was that they could not assert

The
government's
attempts at
mercy

foiled by
plots and by
the reprisals
entailed by
them.

their loyalty without denying their religion; their fate was to be the scapegoats of a very excusable panic.

The panic would have been greater still had it not been for the queen's cool indifference to her own security. Even

The queen's coolness lessens the panic and the severities. when the charmed life of William of Orange fell forfeit to the assassin in July 1584, she hardly seemed alarmed. This courage influenced the

country, and the reprisals were few. With two only out of nearly forty prisoners at Manchester were proceedings pushed to the last extremity (April 20), while one served for an example for Wales on October 17, 1584. Gentler methods were really wiser. Conference might bring some of the prisoners at Wisbeach to a better mind; and who was more likely to do so than Lancelot Andrewes, now of Pembroke College, Cambridge, soon to have a greater fame? A catechism of the controverted points would convince some, and leniency might convince others. So the assizes passed with hardly a victim. The numberless priests in prison were interrogated; they answered unsatisfactorily, but remained where they were. Meanwhile the popular alarm showed itself chiefly in a growing animosity to the Scottish queen and in the organisation of an Association for the Preservation of Her Majesty. The Association began at the Council board on October 18, 1584, and spread from thence. Recusant Lancashire and Cheshire were not a whit behind the other counties in their adoption of it, and parliament devoted time and pains to giving it statutory foundation. Confidence was beginning to revive. A new policy toward the recusant clergy was inaugurated early in the new year (1585), which prescribed the gentler punishment of banishment for all English subjects who were made Jesuits or priests abroad. Towards the end of January, by virtue of a royal commission, the three companions of Campion, who had escaped his fate, were transported to France. Others followed, and for the moment the prisons were clear, though the government could hardly hope for much lasting effect from such a policy. Simultaneously the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts were moving for the release of others, but the lay judges in the Star Chamber disallowed the proposal. Once more, however, the returning confidence was rudely shaken.

When parliament took up the vexed question of the recusant clergy, the Lower House passed a bill on the subject, providing that priests who were found in England, in spite of their sentence of banishment, should be guilty of high treason. It was a great sharpening of severities, and one Dr. Parry, member for Queenborough, to the great offence of the House, spoke violently against it, and was sequestered in consequence; through the queen's intervention, however, he was restored on his apologising and promising amendment. This was at the adjournment for Christmas; and when the House met again and took up the Jesuit Bill in February 1585, Parry, being a prisoner in the Tower, was disabled from attendance, and the tortuosities of a new plot for the assassination of the queen were being untangled.

Parry had been a member of the queen's household. In 1580 he had been pardoned by the queen for a capital offence and allowed to retire for a time to France with the intention of recovering his character. There he had become a Romanist, had fallen in with the foiled plotters of Paris, and undertaken to return and murder the queen. At his first return to England a priest, probably Crichton the Scottish Jesuit, had weakened his confidence in the meritorious character of such an act, which the priests abroad had instilled; and when the moment came to strike, he refrained. Subsequently, the papal approval of his plan, communicated to him by the Cardinal of Como, had dissipated these scruples, so that he returned to his intentions. For one and another cause he had then postponed the deed, and become a member of parliament to see if redress might be had for recusants without such desperate measures. Meanwhile his fellow-conspirators over the sea grew more and more impatient. The ill-success of his parliamentary efforts now brought him back to the more drastic idea; and, had he not in an evil hour concerted plans with Edmund Neville, he might easily have seized one of the numerous occasions that lay open to him as a member of the queen's household, and dealt his blow; but, while he delayed, Neville revealed the secret to the Council. On his arrest, he told the whole story, the papal dispensation was found, and no link of the chain was wanting. His trial

Fresh penal
laws in
the parlia-
ment of 1584,
1585.

The detection
and end of
Parry's plot;

was speedily carried through on February 25, 1585, and his execution followed five days later. The bills for the assurance of the queen's safety and for the sharper dealing with recusant clergy passed with the greater expedition.

Morgan and the Paris circle were baffled again; but not yet discouraged. The government, well aware that many

followed by
that of
Ballard and
Babington,
1586.

plots were still being woven, of which the Queen of Scots was consciously or unconsciously the centre, by a most ingenious extension of the system of spies, in which Secretary Walsingham had already shown himself unrivalled, succeeded in tapping her correspondence. The result was that the authorities were not only in touch with the secret policies of Spain, France, and Scotland, but also on the track of another plot for assassination. Ballard the Jesuit, who had originally obtained the papal sanction for the deed, was the instigator; and he found a weapon in Babington, one of the body of young recusants, whom the queen, defying all prudence, still kept round her person. The government watched the plot grow, till it had enough proof, not only of the plan, but of Mary's complicity in it. The usual traitor appeared in August 1586 to reveal all before the supreme moment came; but Walsingham already knew more than he could tell him. The arrest of Babington which followed, far from allaying alarm and solving difficulty, only began them. The magnitude of the parties involved made this attempt far more serious and exciting than any previous one; and even when time passed and still no Spanish fleet appeared, no French force landed, and no English insurrection broke out, the dangers were sufficiently menacing, and the old peril of the presence in captivity of the Queen of Scots had reached a point which demanded some strenuous action.

The earlier part of the year 1586 had passed in considerable agitation; war with Spain had been imminent ever since

the dismissal of Mendoza the Spanish ambassador.
After a
troublesome
interval,

The feeling against the Recusants had grown fiercer; the prisons were filled with them; the assizes had condemned many priests under the new law, though it was only in a few cases that the death penalty was exacted. Anderton and Marsden, two who were wrecked upon the Isle of Wight and at once apprehended, had indeed suffered it;

but this was no doubt due to the fact that, after first professing loyalty, they had retracted it. Such a course was an evil example, and it elicited a special proclamation of April 10, 1586, setting forth in full their vacillation and the queen's frustrated attempt at mercy. There were probably special reasons also which led to severity in the case of other victims. The law no doubt was savage, but it is difficult to decide whether to call the government savage for passing such a law, or to call it lenient for normally contenting itself with fines, war levies, and forced military service, and for proceeding to extremities in so few cases.

But if the early months were troubled, much more was this the case from August onward. Babington made a full confession, and he, with Ballard, his Jesuit evil genius, and his fellow-conspirators, perished at Tyburn ^{the end of these conspirators.} towards the end of September. The case against Queen Mary had by this time been disentangled, and on October 12 the proceedings against her began at Fotheringhay. Ten days later she was declared guilty of having compassed the queen's destruction.

It was at this juncture that parliament met, having been summoned hastily under stress of the excitement in September. It was a new parliament, but the Council had urged the constituencies to return their late representatives, ^{The new parliament, Oct. 29, 1586, to March 23, 1587, and the execution of Queen Mary.} and had disallowed some elected members of whom it disapproved. Its attitude with regard to the Queen of Scots could hardly be doubtful; both Houses petitioned for her execution; the sentence against her was published by proclamation. Still Philip's fleet delayed, no French army landed to rescue its queen dowager, no hindrance was offered by the Scottish king on behalf of his mother, no rising was made to eject the protestant from the throne and seat the papist in her place. Only the reluctance of Elizabeth delayed the execution, and, when she overcame it and signed the warrant, before she could recall her signature, Mary was beheaded on February 8, 1587.

Parliament had spent all its time up to December over this business. Meanwhile the convocation was busy securing the enforcement of the canons, reforming abuses in the diocese of Norwich, and issuing orders for clerical study and the

training of preachers. When the Commons met again in February, they were soon busy with ecclesiastical affairs, and the last stage was now reached for the present in the struggle between Crown and parliament for authority to supervise the Church. A puritan petition to convocation had met with no response. Twice already there had been presented to parliament a bill and book, which were to produce the desired reformation. On the first occasion they left no mark on history; their second appearance has been already recorded (p. 231), but it probably had no further effect than to influence the petitions which were then the occasion of much discussion. Now Mr. Cope returned to the charge, demanding a hearing for a bill which apparently went further than the previous ones, since it declared void all existing laws about ecclesiastical government; and producing again the book—a reprint of Knox's Genevan *Form of Common Prayers*—which it was proposed to substitute everywhere for the prayer-book (February 27, 1587). The time passed in discussion as to whether these documents should be read or not, and at the end of the day the queen sent for the bills and the books of both the late and the present parliament, and on the following day for the Speaker. Meanwhile wrath gathered in the breast of Peter Wentworth, one of the puritan champions, at what seemed to him a gross interference with the liberties of the House; on the next day he vented it and was sent to the Tower, and followed there the ensuing day by Cope and three others who were responsible for the bill and book.

Two days later the Vice-chamberlain spoke, justifying the queen's intervention, and giving the official reply to the proposals. He touched upon the unreasonableness of substituting the new book for the old; and pointed out that the bill and book, besides breaking the Uniformity Act by depraving the prayer-book, went against the Articles of Religion established by joint authority of Church and State. But he reserved his chief argument to show that the new proposals were entirely revolutionary; they would abolish such lay privileges as patronage and impropriations, besides overthrowing the existing ecclesiastical system and injuring the prerogatives, revenues, and dignities of the Crown.

Puritan
efforts in the
Lower House,
Feb. 1587.

The official
quietus
given by Sir
C. Hatton;

The agitation survived yet for some days; a petition from imprisoned ministers in Essex and transactions about the members in the Tower kept it simmering; finally, the queen's speech at the end of parliament so far suppressed it, that for the rest of the reign parliamentary attempts to control the Church waned.

reinforced
by the
queen's
speech.

She asserted once again her own supremacy in the matter, deprecated changes, pronounced the proposed measures frivolous and injurious, and re-stated the constitutional principle that "if any thing were amiss," as indeed she conceded was the case, "it appertaineth to the clergy more properly to see the same redressed." The agitation for the Genevan platform by no means dropped in other places when it ceased to be effective in parliament. Convocation felt the force of it, and addressed the queen on the subject on March 23, 1587, when parliament was over; while from the puritan side there came *The Humble Petition of the Communitie* to the queen denouncing the bishops. But the chief movement in favour of the presbyterian system was more secret.

Failing to secure parliamentary authority, the Puritans set to work more systematically than before to introduce their platform quietly. The Book of Discipline was amended, and they bound themselves by subscription to it; they formed presbyteries in parishes; selected elders to administer the discipline; formed a "classis" for neighbourhoods where they were strong, as, e.g., in Warwickshire and Northamptonshire; held their half-yearly synods at Cambridge, Warwick, Coventry, and Ipswich, and their general assembly concurrently with parliament at Coventry.

The dis-
content is
driven in.

Simultaneously with this change in the character of the agitation, the literary war, which had gone on without intermission in recent years, was now assuming a fresh importance.

In 1584 the Puritans, feeling the need of some fresh manifesto, had put forth in print a short treatise which had been written some years before, but not printed. It bore on the title-page *A Brief and Plain Declaration concerning the desires of all those . . . that . . . seek for the Discipline and Reformation of the Church . . .*; but it had as its heading *A Learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government*, and was known

A restate-
ment of
puritan pleas.

by both names. Here the whole of the puritan contention was tersely and temperately put within the compass of 150 small pages: it was by far the best statement that had appeared. It started, as was natural, with the assumption, that lay at the bottom of all the puritan arguments, that the only right form of government in the Church was to be found in the Bible. It seized on the list of church gifts set down by St. Paul in Eph. iv. 11 as being the scriptural warrant in question; then, somewhat arbitrarily, it laid down that some of these gifts were temporary and some only were permanent; then, by combining this passage with Rom. xii. 7, and eliminating what was held to be only temporary, it arrived at four offices, which it defined to represent the divine and the immutable form of church government, namely, doctors, pastors, governors, and deacons. Whatever else than this can be shown to have prevailed in the Church is, it was contended, *ipso facto* mere corruption; this must be at once restored at all costs, for all else is Antichrist; if it can be shown that in fact this has never existed, it must none the less be begun at once. Indeed, the author, in contrasting his system with that of the Papists, says expressly that theirs is an old discredited system, while his has the imperative merit of being "one not yet handled."

Doctors and pastors have to do with doctrine, governors and deacons with discipline. As regards doctrine, the pastor's first duty is to teach, and his second to secure a right administration of the sacraments; and, since this is impossible in the hands of unlearned and unpreaching ministers, all such must be cast out forthwith. Simultaneously all pluralities must be abolished, endowments equalised, and increased by the restoration of the abbey lands and of the other impropriations; while additional ministers are to be found by a reform of the universities.

The disciplinary system was also superimposed upon this dubiously biblical foundation. In each cure there must be a consistory or seignory of elders, which, with the pastor, will correct faults in the congregation, without the scandals which result from episcopal discipline; the pastor also with the congregation will care for the poor by the agency of deacons—not the popish sort of deacons, but the

The proposed
system for
doctrine

and discipline.

godly sort found in the Scriptures. Above this local organisation there is the synod, which, according to the example of Acts xii., consists of pastors, elders, teachers, and men of weight; its duty is to settle controversies and appeals, having also a conjoint share with the congregation in the choice of pastors. The book ended with a carefully defined statement of the puritan view of the royal supremacy as a thing unobjectionable, so long as it did not infringe upon God's law—a proviso which merely begged the question. There was, no doubt, a great deal to be said in favour of much of this programme, and it would have been better if the bishops had tried to discriminate the desirable from the undesirable. Moreover, the little book was penned in an unusually restrained style, and the case was set out with studied moderation: it was a real attempt to conciliate.

But no conciliation was possible since the two parties were absolutely opposed in their premisses. A reply was all that could be looked for, and if any one had ventured to hope that it might be as moderate in tone and in bulk as its rival, he was certainly disappointed. When the little book first appeared, Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, preached against it at Paul's Cross, and apparently with some effect. When challenged by his opponents, he in an evil hour undertook to answer it more at large; and at last, in 1587, a portly quarto of 1409 pages came forth, under the title *A Defence of the Government established in the Church of England*, to testify to his industry, if not to his discretion. Paragraph by paragraph, and almost line by line, he followed up the little eirenicon, only turning aside once to devote one of his sixteen books to another opponent. It was an attempt to smother "The New Tetrarchie," as the novel scheme of ministry was nicknamed.

If Dr. Bridges' effort had drawn forth no other rejoinder than the two modest tomes which came out in quick response to defend, the one "the godly ministers," the other "the ecclesiastical discipline," it might very naturally have sunk by its own proper weight into oblivion; but, on the contrary, it produced an entirely new feature, which was calculated, even in a year of excitement such as 1588, to arrest the attention of the nation, and to bring

The reply of
Dr. Bridges

provokes the
first Mar-
prelate tract
The Epistle,
1588.

out the whole controversy from the studies of the ecclesiastical and the learned into the arena of popular discussion.

In the autumn of 1588 a small ill-printed tract began to pass rapidly from hand to hand, amid peals of laughter from the large Elizabethan public that loved a joke; it was accompanied, however, by frowns from the Puritans, who had no saving grace of humour, and by rage alike on the part of the prelates, who were so hardly hit by the libel, and of the government, that was so openly affronted by its publication. It leapt into the arena with all the merriment of the clown. "Oh, read over D. John Bridges," it irreverently began on its very title-page, "for it is a worthy work: *Or an Epitome of the fyrst booke of that right worshipfull volume . . . Written against the Puritanes . . . by . . . John Bridges . . . Compiled for the behoofe and overthrow of the Parsons, Fyckers, and Cureats that have lerrnt their Catechismes, and are past grace: By the reverend and worthie Martin Marprelate, gentleman, and dedicated to the Confocationhouse. The Epitome is not yet published, but it shall be when the Bysshops are at convenient leysure to view the same. In the meane time, let them be content with this learned Epistle. Printed oversea, in Europe, within two furlongs of a Bouncing Priest, at the cost and charges of M. Marprelate, gentleman.*"

There followed fifty-two pages of brilliant and unsparing satire, such as never had been seen in English before: impudence conspired with the veiled indignation, which underlies all real satire, to make the catalogue of real or false scandals, charged against the bishops, most amusing reading. There is no plan or argument in this "Epistle to the terrible Priests of the Confocation house." One after another the authorities are flouted or aspersed, and the main object is to hurl as much mud, and in as merry and malicious a fashion, as possible. Whitgift is roughly handled from the day when, as is falsely stated, he carried Dr. Perne's cloak-bag after him, down to his latest dealings with the irreconcilables. But Aylmer, Bishop of London, comes off worse still: he swears, he plays at bowls on Sundays, he has cut down the elms at Fulham, he has fought with his son-in-law and his neighbours, he has stolen, he has defrauded, he has forbidden public fasts, he has oppressed the godly:—

Its contents.

there was no end to the malicious charges that this pseudonymous author had been raking together against him without regard either to truth or mercy.

Hardly had the readers recovered from *The Epistle* when a new tract appeared, namely, *The Epitome*, already promised. Starting with a very similar title-page, and a second letter, "to all the Cleargie Masters," as full of *The Epitome* follows. impudence as the previous pages, it went on to an examination of Dr. Bridges' first book, not in the heavy style of the day, but in Martin's own particular vein. The heaping up of gross personalities, however, now gives way to something more like argument. Martin sees clearly the real point at issue, and states it concisely thus: "Whether the externall gouvernement of the Church of Christ be a thing so prescribed by the Lorde in the new testament, as it is not lawfull for any man to alter the same . . . The puritans saye that these offices and officers, whiche our sauour Christe and his Apostles did ordaine, are vnchangeable . . . The doctor with all the Lordly priests in the land hold the contrarie." Apart from the question-begging relative clause, this is an exact summary of the whole. Bishop Aylmer again shares with the Dean the chief part of Martin's attentions, and his book, written thirty years before against Knox, is almost as much handled as Bridges' own.

It was high time that some counter measures should be taken. Martin could not be allowed to win the public verdict by mere mockery. The watchful Burghley, already in November, on the first appearance of *The Epistle*,^{A reply by Bishop Cooper of Winchester.} had moved the archbishop to detect and punish its authors with the help of the other bishops, and by means of the ecclesiastical commission; and in the following February Martin's two tracts had earned him the honour of a royal proclamation, which confiscated all copies of such libels, and called for information leading to the discovery of their authors. The bishops, failing to catch the parties concerned, or to fasten the responsibility upon Udall, at any rate provided a rejoinder, for in January 1589, almost simultaneously with *The Epitome*, there appeared *An Admonition to the People of England*, answering Martin's slanders and charges. The initials T.C., with which it was signed, betokened Thomas

Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, who had come in for his own share of venom, and now stood out to run the risk of incurring more by defending both the characters and the position of the much-maligned hierarchy.

It was a grave defence of both : particular slanders were first refuted in order, and then some telling criticism of the new proposal followed, with a fairly temperate justification of the existing state of things. ^{Its character.} It was unfortunate that, while the existence of abuses was more frankly recognised than usual, no hopes were held out of any speedy attempts to remedy them. The authorities both ecclesiastical and civil held that it was impolitic to take any steps at all, even desirable ones, in the direction in which the Puritans pointed, on the ground that such a course would only encourage them in their stubborn opposition. Some illuminating points stand out in this brief and dignified reply. When the liturgy, episcopacy, and discipline of the Church were denounced as popish, Cooper was not prepared to accept that as equivalent to a condemnation ; and when the archbishop himself was twitted with his likeness to papists, and with the statement of a Reims professor that he found signs of a catholic persuasion in some points of his book against the *Admonition to Parliament*, his apologist replies : " My Lord of Canterbury would be sorry from the bottom of his heart if his persuasion and the grounds thereof were not Catholic." In opposition to the crudely biblical method of the Puritans, Cooper re-stated the Church's rule of faith in these terms : " . . . to have the grounds of their faith and religion so established upon the Holy Scriptures, that for the interpretation of the same they have the testimony and consent of the Primitive Church and the ancient learned Fathers. From which consent they should not depart either in doctrine or other matter of weight unless . . . forced thereto either by the plain words of the Scriptures, or by evident and necessary conclusions following upon the same, or the analogy of our faith." The growth of the puritan opposition was ably sketched from the mild beginnings of the vestiarian controversy to the full presbyterian position, and to the sectarian separatism, which was its legitimate outcome.

Two more tracts were successfully launched by Martin,

the second of them a reply to Cooper's *Admonition* under the title *Ha y' any work for Cooper*; but then a check came. The secret press from which they issued had already fled from place to place. Mrs. Crane had housed it at East Molesey in Surrey, then Sir Richard Knightley at Fawsley in Northamptonshire, then Mr. Hales at Coventry. Four tracts were thus accounted for, besides Udall's two books and Penry's *Supplication to the Parliament*. But now Waldegrave, the printer, rebelled and refused to go on. His refusal was not due to fear, for he had already been ousted from his business because of his previous publications, and he had no more to lose; but he noted the strong hostility of the puritan leaders to Martin's performances, and determined to have no more to do with them. A new printer was found called Hodgkins, and the work was moved to Manchester. There the government made its first success, and seized the whole plant with a half-completed issue of the new tract which had been promised in the last, entitled *More Work for Cooper*; but Martin himself and his printer escaped.

Other replies more on Martin's own level now began to make their appearance. He was ridiculed on the stage in London; but his deriders found that it was dangerous to turn his own weapons too successfully against him, for the authorities found it necessary to intervene in order to keep the controversy within bounds. Then came tracts on the same side, *A Whip for an Ape*, *Mar-Martin*, and others; while two more issued from the hand of Martin himself, printed at Woolston with type belonging to Penry. These ended the series of genuine works of the original Martin, making a total of seven brought out in seven months; but Martin had his imitators, and the fusillade was kept up briskly from both sides for some time longer.

Martin himself disappeared as mysteriously as he had appeared, and he remains unidentified to the present day. The government succeeded in tracing out a very large part of the history of his works, but the absolute identity of Martin was never established. Udall probably had only influenced the preliminary stages. It is clear that Penry had,

The flight and
pursuit of the
Martinist
press.

Further ex-
change of
firing till
Martin
ceased.

at any rate, the whole of the working of the press in his hands; he certainly knew who Martin was, and perhaps he was the only person who did. On the other hand, there is a difficulty in recognising the style as his, and it is therefore very possible that he was acting as agent for some one else—for Barrow now in prison, or possibly for Job Throckmorton, a layman whose shadow hovers rather continuously round the confines of the Marprelate mystery.

While the country had been laughing, fuming, and smarting at these libels, the long-threatened storm of Spanish

The Armada
and its effect
on persecu-
tion before-
hand invasion had burst at last. It had been long expected; all through 1587 rumours and preparations had occupied every one's mind. Many precautions were taken. A return of recusants

was made, which showed, in 30 English counties, 10 knights, and 24 ladies of title, and over 250 gentry. They were disarmed and made to provide armour for others, the commissions of the peace were revised, and great care was taken to secure men sound in religion for all posts of importance. Walsingham's spies were hard at work. They were not the most reputable men, especially when they were recruited from renegades who were ready, like the notorious priest Anthony Tyrrell, to change continually from one side to the other, and lie indiscriminately on both sides. Largely through their agency many seminary priests were sent to the prisons; in March 1588 there were 109 in captivity, of whom Wisbeach claimed 17 and the London prisons 33. Little, however, was done with them, and in Norwich and other centres they enjoyed in prison a dangerous amount of liberty. From time to time the prisoners underwent examinations on the points at issue; but severe dealing was, as a rule, confined to those who returned after having once been banished. The priests who were executed in 1587 seem to have been offenders in this way, and the same was the case with a large proportion of those executed when the panic was at its height, from July to October 1588; for even then special efforts were made by the law officers of the Crown to distinguish traitors from the simple and ignorant. The victims numbered over thirty in all, including ten laymen; and, following an evil precedent set in 1586 when the saintly

Margaret Clithero was accused of harbouring priests and pressed to death at York, Margaret Ward, a gentlewoman who had helped a priest to escape from Bridewell, was among those who suffered torture and death.

When the fears died down in October a new policy began : there was propounded to the colony of lay recusants, lately established at the palace at Ely, such a form of protestation of loyalty "as no subject in this land ^{and subsequently,} professing loyalty to her Majesty can refuse to subscribe." It was one more of the many attempts of the government to distinguish between loyal and disloyal recusants ; it was also more successful than most of them, for arrangements were made for those who subscribed, on satisfying the Archbishop of Canterbury of their continuance in loyalty, to be set free though obliged to dwell in a certain area. When the policy succeeded the same instrument was offered to other recusants with a view to their release. This did not, however, mean a cessation of persecution ; the fines were as oppressive as ever, and family after family was brought to ruin through attempts at composition with the Crown, or the continual drain of an annual mulct equal to £3000 of our present money.

The Armada came, threatened, failed, and disappeared. Leaving Spain on May 18, 1588, it was kept back by hindrances and not sighted off the English coast till July 19. The Channel was filled with skirmishing ^{Its collapse forms a landmark.} from then until the change of wind came, which wafted the Spanish fleet out of the battle at Gravelines on July 29, and, growing thereupon into a hurricane, drove the remaining ships before it to perish on the inhospitable islands north of Scotland and in the Atlantic breakers on the west coast of Ireland.

Its collapse formed a landmark in the history more definitely than it was possible to realise at the time. As the prayers that went up at the imminent expectation of its arrival melted gradually into thanksgiving, while the news of its failure and dispersion spread from place to place through every town and village, the nation breathed again, and with a cry of relief leapt into an impulsive optimism. Great as the blow was, it could still hardly be foreseen that Spain

would never recover from it, that the Spanish influence was thenceforward, for one cause or another, a waning element in the politics of England, and that the prospect of England's return to the Roman obedience was a fading ecclesiastical vision. But through the anxieties, negotiations, plots, struggles, and diplomacy that still remained, these facts slowly emerged; and since 1588, it is hardly too much to say, England has been politically and ecclesiastically another country.

AUTHORITIES.—The *S.P. Dom.* are full of information as to dealings with recusants. The draft declaration is in clii. 91. Burghley's tracts are reprinted in Gibson, *Preservative against Popery* and the *Somers Tracts*.

Vaux's *Catechism* has been reprinted for the Chetham Society. Chapman's case is in *S.P. Dom.* clv. 8; the oath is in clx. 44, and Strype. Challoner, *Memoir*, gives biographies of recusant victims. The commission to banish priests is in *S.P. Dom.* clxxvi. 9. For the loyal association see *S.P. Dom.* clxxiii.-clxxvi.

The puritan petition to the convocation of 1587 is in *Part of a Register*, so is the *Humble Petition of the Communitie*. For the puritan substitutes for the prayer-book see Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*. For the presbyterian platform see *Dangerous Positions*, u.s.

For Marprelate see Arber, *Introduction to the M.M. Controversy*; Maskell, *Martin Marprelate*; Dexter, *Congregationalism*. Some Marprelate tracts were reprinted by Petheram, 1843-1846. Arber has reprinted others on both sides of the controversy.

The *Privy Council Acts* show the dealings with recusants in 1588. The return of laity and clergy is in British Museum, Lansd. MS. lv., and some of the archbishop's dealings are in lvii. For the Armada see Corbett, *Drake and the Tudor Navy*.

CHAPTER XV

SECTARIES AND RECUSANTS DURING THE LAST YEARS OF ELIZABETH

THE closing period of the reign of Elizabeth reveals to a superficial view little else but the development of tendencies which have already been clearly shown; but on a close scrutiny there are seen to lie underneath the surface the increasing signs of the presence of a new force and character in the Church. For the first five years the conflict with puritanism was open and violent; then the stringent discipline of Whitgift and the resolute hostility of the queen told; and upon the last ten years of the reign there rested a comparative calm. This was due partly to the vigorous repression; but still more to the quiet working of the new leaven of a different churchmanship, more convinced but less cocksure, — more firmly and intelligently attached to the faith and discipline of the Church, but more ready to acknowledge her shortcomings and abuses. Whitgift's strong arm stemmed the tide of puritan revolution, when under Grindal it seemed to have acquired the mastery; but Whitgift, though he could be generous and even gentle to an opponent, could not convince him. It was left for the massive reasoning and studied moderation of a Hooker, for the catholicity and saintliness of an Andrewes, to attempt this task, and in a good measure to accomplish it.

The last
fifteen years
of the reign.
1588-1603.

In the five years of storm such qualities made but little show; the conflicts with separatist, recusant, and puritan were still too much characterised by din and dust. In describing these years, the first of these conflicts deserves a

certain precedence because it presents more novel features than the rest, and because it soonest came to the end of its development.

The separatist principles of Browne and Harrison had not advanced much since they won their first martyrs in 1583 ;
The end of Browne's career. Browne himself had soon quarrelled with the exiles at Middelburg, and departed with a small party to Scotland, where he was quickly in trouble and was thrown into prison. Soon finding himself unexpectedly at liberty, he returned to England. There his former history repeated itself, until his impulsiveness took a new turn, and, on being excommunicated by his diocesan, he submitted to authority, resigned himself to conformity, and, after five years of lay work was re-admitted, in September 1591, to an uneventful ministry of forty years in the Church. He had probably never seriously reckoned all that was involved in leaving it. But the position which had failed ultimately to satisfy him was taken up by others, and under new leadership the Brownists continued without Browne.

The new leaders were speedily in controversy with him, and indeed obtained their first notoriety through upholding his principles against himself. Greenwood and
The new separatist leaders. Barrow hardly appeared upon the scene until they were so far pronounced in their views as to be worthy of the dungeons of the government, from which, indeed, thereafter they emerged but little. Greenwood had received holy orders, but he found the post of domestic chaplain to a puritan peer, Lord Rich, more congenial than the tenure of a cure ; in this retirement he came to see the instability of the puritan position, and embraced separatist principles. The young minister found a companion in Henry Barrow, a lawyer some ten years older than himself, who, after a sudden conversion from profligacy to godliness, had come under his influence ; and the two men came to the front as leaders of the separatist body in London.

On October 7, 1586, Greenwood was arrested while conducting a private conventicle, and sent to the Clink prison ; thither went Barrow on October 19 to visit his friend ; the authorities were on the watch for him, and he was himself detained by the gaoler till the afternoon, when two pursuivants

came from Lambeth with an order from the ecclesiastical commission, and carried him off thither to his first examination before the commissioners. There he began by refusing to be sworn or to say whether he had or not stated "that there is not a true Church in England"; attendance at church he equally refused, and with it the offer of bail; so he was sent to the Gatehouse. At a second examination a week later he was equally obdurate; so five months were allowed to elapse, and then both he and Greenwood were summoned before a special commission of the chief judges and bishops. The archbishop treated Barrow with consideration, gave him a list of the charges brought against him, and, waiving the question of the oath, allowed him to write answers to them: this much emerges from Barrow's own account, in spite of his own obvious anti-clerical prejudice.

The imprisonment of Greenwood and Barrow, 1586.

Eleven interrogatories were given him, and answered: the subjects covered by them included forms of prayer in general; the prayer-book in particular, which Barrow described as "well-nigh altogether idolatrous, superstitious, and popish"; the sacraments of the Church, which he denied to be true sacraments; the ecclesiastical law and system, much of which he affirmed to be unlawful and anti-christian; the supremacy, which he acknowledged, while denying "any laws for the Church other than Christ hath already left in his Word." His answers led to much discussion, and after an interval three final questions were put to him—one general, and two touching the kernel of the Brownist views. "Will you take the oath of supremacy?" "No, but I acknowledge the queen, and will profess entire loyalty." "Ought the Church to reform abuses without staying for the prince?" "Yes, even though forbidden on pain of death." "May the Church excommunicate the prince?" "Yes, and the pastor ought to pronounce sentence." These replies brought him within the toils of the law of 1581 against the withdrawal of subjects from their obedience to the Crown. Consequently, in May 1587, Barrow, and, with him, Greenwood, who had undergone a similar examination with similar results, were indicted at the sessions at Newgate, and were returned to the Fleet prison to find their sureties for £260.

Their tenets and their treatment by the judges,

Apparently arrangements were made by which they were released ; but they again broke out into open opposition, and were sent back to prison on July 20, 1587. The prisoners are characteristically silent about this turn of affairs in their own account of their sufferings, which is unfortunately the sole evidence available for the greater part of the story.

A petition came out of the prison on March 13, 1588, to the queen, protesting against the close confinement there ; and, perhaps in response to it, Barrow was summoned to answer at the Council board. He treated the Council much as he had treated the ecclesiastical commission or the divines who had come to confer with him in prison. He gave four reasons for separation, which became the central features of future controversy : the Church includes all the profane and wicked of the land, its ministry is anti-christian, its worship idolatrous and superstitious, its government Romish. To his urging of these points he added a strong protest against his having been convicted under a statute made for papists ; and after much talk, he finally ended by calling the archbishop "a monster, a miserable compound ; I know not what to make him ; he is neither ecclesiastical or civil, even that second beast spoken of in the Revelation." The five years that remained to him of life Barrow seems to have spent continuously in prison, while Greenwood enjoyed some intervals of liberty until he finally came back to share Barrow's fate. The confinement was, however, not very rigorous ; for, though the prisoners complained to Burghley of the denial to them of writing materials, of the watches and continual searches, and the rifling of all their papers and writings, they found means to issue two manifestoes and to conduct various controversies from the seclusion of the prison ; moreover, their agents in these matters were friends and fellow-prisoners who had access to them in virtue of letters from the archbishop.

Of the disputes which were raging at the time outside, Bredwell's attack on Glover and the foundations of Brownism only touched them incidentally ; their first direct controversy was with the puritan leaders, Cartwright and others, during the latter part of 1588, while the bishops were too busy with the Marprelate affair

Their
quarrels with
the puritan
party.

to pay much attention to the prisoners. Here the bitterness was at its greatest, for puritan and sectary were so entirely agreed upon the greater part of the matters of controversy against the conformists, that their difference as to the lawfulness of remaining in communion with them was highly accentuated. Each had the same grievances. The Puritan felt that they were not such as to make communion with the Church intolerable, though they did make conformity impossible; and he on that ground was regarded by the Sectary as a half-hearted person who shrank from taking the action which his convictions demanded. He in turn regarded the Sectary as a hot-headed person who had weakened the hopes of the puritan revolution by withdrawal into unwarrantable schism. There was also a difference of opinion as to the lengths to which separation should go. Browne had never gone so far as to rebaptize; and, though many of his followers held the sacraments of the Church to be no sacraments, since it, being polluted by communion with the ungodly, was no Church, most of them followed his example in this respect: but the extreme men scorned such half measures and braved the danger of being branded as "anabaptists"—a term which still reeked of antinomianism and vileness from the associations which clung round it since the excesses of the German anabaptists at Münster in the earlier days of the century.

In the spring of 1589 the special commission took up afresh the case of Barrow, produced new interrogatories, and required a new set of answers, without letting him see the previous ones; but again the matter dropped, and nothing further was done that year. Barrow spent the time in writing a brief manifesto, called *A True Description of the Visible Church*, which set forth briefly, in biblical language of much elevation and dignity, the ideal of which he was dreaming, puritan in its hierarchy, but in organisation congregational, not presbyterian. It was not his first manifesto, for already he had put out *A Brief Summe of the Causes of our Separation*; but now for the first time, through the financial support and co-operation of Robert Stokes, he secured for the dissemination of his views the invaluable help of a printing-press at Dort in Holland. More was soon to follow, but of a more controversial type; for early in 1590 the special

The conferences in
1589, 1590,

commission took up again its dealings with Barrow and Greenwood. On an order from the archbishop and the two chief-justices, arrangements were made by the Bishop of London and the ecclesiastical commission for conference with the fifty sectaries who were then in London prisons; forty-two preachers were assigned to them, headed by Archdeacon Mullens, Lancelot Andrewes, now Prebendary of St. Paul's and Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Hutchinson, and Cotton, of whom the first three were told off to deal with Barrow and Greenwood. For their guidance "A briefe of the positions holden by the new sectorie of recusants" was drawn up in twelve articles. No record exists of conferences with the generality of the prisoners, but Barrow and Greenwood subsequently printed their account of what took place at seven conferences held with them in March and April, the first set by Hutchinson, Andrewes, and Bright, the second by three puritan ministers, Sperin, Egerton, and Cooper.

The chief subjects of discussion were the Articles, and with them a book which Dr. Some had recently written, diverging a moment from the controversy which he was carrying on with Penry in order to attack the more pronounced sectaries. Both the prisoners refused communion with the Church. Barrow did so on the grounds already alleged in his examination, while Greenwood took a historical line, saying that the Church of England consisted of all sorts of profane people who were by the blowing of her Majesty's trumpet at her coronation in one day received, without conversion of life by faith or repentance. This was supposed to imply a self-evident justification of separation, and there lay behind it also the assumption that the popish Church was no true Church; neither Hutchinson, however, nor Andrewes would grant either of these points. With the puritan ministers the Separatists had more common ground. These visitors did not wish, as Andrewes did, to interpret the Scriptures by the Fathers, or to maintain episcopacy and the historic ministry, or the Descent into Hell; moreover, they gave away their case by calling the disciplinary authority of the bishops and the commissioners "merely civil." The prisoners had some correspondence with Egerton in the hope of winning concessions from him, but he told them in his first reply that their draft

and the
points then
at issue.

account of the recent conference with him was unfair, and in his second he was curt and unsympathetic. The interchange of letters, however, continued, until it ended, on May 11, 1590, "in vanitie, vituperie, and blasphemie," having outlived the series of conferences by a month.

Shortly after this two little volumes were printed abroad and dispersed in England, which contained, besides the conferences and the Egerton correspondence, the *Slandorous articles* in which the bishops summarised the Brownist tenets and the answers of the prisoners to them. Meanwhile the books of the Sectaries had been answered: from the church standpoint Alison wrote *A Plaine Confutation*, dealing with the manifesto about the Visible Church, the Articles, and the conferences, while Gifford from the puritan side began an attack on "the Donatists of England whom we call Brownists." This last attack the prisoners specially resented, and they made several replies to it, some of which were seized on the way to press or immediately on issuing from it. The year 1591 passed in such labours as these; then the printing ceased; perhaps the custody was stricter; certainly Stokes ceased to be a sectary and returned to the Church. Greenwood had another period of liberty, but there was no outlet for Barrow; and the public conference on which, like the papist recusants, the Separatists set so much store, was steadily denied them.

An interval
of book-war
only, May
1590-Dec.
1592.

After a year, characterised by little except two fresh attempts on the part of the prisoners to get a fresh hearing, Greenwood was rearrested on December 5, 1592, and the last act of the tragedy began. All around the prospects of the dissidents looked gloomy. The nonconformists had much to lament. Their propaganda had recently been greatly discredited: a mad conspiracy had been concocted by Hacket, Copinger, and Arthington to murder the queen as a preliminary to the establishment of the Discipline. It was a poor crack-brained affair; but the government saw the expediency of magnifying its seriousness, and fastening the discredit on the nonconformists. The puritan leaders were also in trouble. Cartwright, after a brief period of peace as Master of Leicester's Hospital at Warwick, had been called up to account for his proceedings; and he had

Strong
measures
against non-
conformity

now been in prison for nearly two years, undergoing examination by the commissioners and by the Council in the Star Chamber. Udall had long been suspected of being connected with the Marprelate libels. While he had from the first disowned any direct connexion with them, he could not deny his connexion with the secret press that produced them, nor his authorship of *Diotrephes* and the *Demonstration of Discipline* which it disseminated. He had therefore been brought up from Newcastle after a year of unlicensed ministry there, and after six months' inquiry he was sent to the Gatehouse: a trial at the assizes followed in 1590, at which he was condemned for seditious libel. Sentence was then deferred, and when later on, after his refusal to recant, the penalty of death was pronounced, through Whitgift's influence it was not executed. Much interest was made in his favour. Attempts were made to bring him to conformity or to dispose of him in work abroad, but they failed; and he died in prison at the end of 1592. When men like these, who disowned and opposed separatist principles, were in such case, there seemed little hope for the leaders of the Sectaries.

Barrow and Greenwood were next brought to account; and, to make matters worse, during the crisis of their trial the news spread that Penry was taken. His activity had begun in a passionate appeal for pity for the spiritual desolation of Wales, which developed into a passionate hostility to the Church authorities, on whom he threw the blame: then came his connexion with Udall and with Marprelate, and he fled to Scotland to escape from a warrant of the Council for his apprehension. He had by this time passed from the principles of nonconformity to those of separatism, and he was drawn back to London to share the fate of its leaders.

The same statute of 1581 against seditious libels which had condemned Udall was now to be the weapon against Barrow and Greenwood. They were brought to the bar with four others on March 21, 1593. At the examination held on the earlier days of the month the history of the printing of their books had been laid bare till they acknowledged authorship; it was therefore easy to select from their pages matter which could be

prepare for
stringency
against the
Sectaries.

The execu-
tion of
Barrow and
Greenwood,
April 6, 1593.

distorted into sedition, and so secure the conviction, which was regarded as the natural outcome of official prosecutions. Condemned to death on the 23rd, they were reprieved as they started for execution on the day following, and an attempt was made at a conference: this failing, another start was made for execution on March 31, and the halter was round the necks of the two chiefs when another reprieve came. Finally, on April 6, as a bill against nonconformity and the attendance at conventicles was passing through parliament, the sentence was actually carried out, and Barrow and Greenwood were early and secretly hanged at Tyburn.

Penry did not long survive them: there was the like examination intended to secure charges against him from his writings, and the like conference to bring him to a different mind; then followed a similar trial on May 21, and a verdict which was equally a foregone conclusion. Here, however, there was no delay in the execution of the sentence, for on the 29th he was told at dinner-time to prepare for death, and at five o'clock he was hanged.

The history of the new Conventicle Act just mentioned has been perverted by puritan and separatist writers, who wished both then and since to fasten the odium of it on the bishops. In fact it had its origin in the Commons as a bill against recusants of the Romanist sort only. When it had passed two readings the House reduced its stringency, and then made it applicable to Brownists and Barrowists as well: at this point it was dropped, and a fortnight later (March 31) a new bill came from the Lords, framed as an amendment and addition to the previous act of 1581. This concerned both Romanist and separatist sectaries, who were now for the first time distinguished in treatment. Every recusant who resisted the royal authority, seduced others, or attended conventicles was now made liable to imprisonment; not being "popish" he had then before him the alternatives of either conforming or of going into banishment. But a second act laid down another procedure for "popish" recusants; they could be confined within an area of five miles from their home, and were only liable to banishment if they broke through this restraint. It was not advisable to banish popish recusants, for they were

and of Penry,
May 29.

New penal
laws against
recusancy,
both popish
and
separatist.

to a large extent persons of substance ; it was more profitable to keep them under fine and supervision at home ; sectaries, however, were persons of small account, of whom the country would be well rid. There was thus good reason for this divergence of policy.

If it seemed as though the popish recusant was to come off better than his separatist rival, this was not the case in the

The effect
on the
Sectaries.

actual working out of the recusancy laws. The three martyrs had suffered under the earlier law ; but from the passing of this act no more separatists were put to death ; some indeed were claimed as victims by the prisons, but otherwise they were subject henceforward to no worse lot than banishment. Thus it came to pass that Francis Johnson, who was taken with Greenwood in December 1592, had a very different fate from him : he was kept in prison for nearly five years, and, when sentenced under the new act to abjure the realm, he was put on board a vessel bound for North America. When the vessel returned, he rejoined the members of the London conventicle of Brownists, which having been constituted in September and broken up in December 1592, had since collected at Amsterdam. There, with Johnson among its leaders, it began a new era in its history, illustrative of the fissile character of separatism.

It would have been happier if the cessation of Romanist martyrdoms had also dated from this point. Unfortunately

Increased
persecution
of recusants.

the relief which came with the failure of the Armada did not last long. Within a year it was found that enlargement of the prisoners was acting as an encouragement of others. London saw no executions in 1589, though eight persons suffered at York and Oxford ; but early in 1590 the Council ordered steps to be taken to convict some of the seminaries in custody, and on March 4, under special directions of the Council, an Italian friar named Bono, a seminary named Bayles, and two lay companions were executed there. The fear was reviving, for Spain was fitting out a new Armada. A campaign against recusants was ordered, with the object of increasing the harvest of fines ; many were sent back again to be under supervision in their old quarters at Ely and Wisbeach, while new depots were formed at Banbury and at Farnham Castle for the 300 Hampshire recus-

ants. In the north there was a recrudescence of recusancy: 700 were returned from Lancashire and 200 from Cheshire, and special measures were required; so the alarm and with it the persecution grew. A proclamation against Jesuits and seminaries marked the autumn of 1591, and a series of special commissions for recusancy in the counties marked the ensuing winter, so that by 1592 matters were again at an extremity; and though the victims of that year were only three, as against fifteen in the previous year, it was because many had been driven by these vigorous measures to conform. It was reported from Lancashire at the end of 1591 that all recusants had been driven to church or to prison. The question as to the lawfulness of attending the services was again being raised, and the defections were so many that Allen, recently made cardinal, writing at the end of 1592 to comfort his fellows in England in the heat of the persecution, renewed and sealed with a fresh prohibition from the reigning pope the decision "that conformity is unlawful by God's owne eternall law"; but he pleaded for great compassion and mercifulness on behalf of those who had given in under pressure.

The seminary priests also succumbed in considerable numbers to the alternative pressure of torture, or menace, or godly persuasion. Of four who were condemned at Chichester in September 1588, one named Owen yielded at the conference which took place after their conviction. At the trial there had been, as usual, much argument as to the relation of religion and treason; the prosecution had said, as before, that no inquiry was made into religious opinions, but that when men were found to do acts in defiance of the law, it was traitorous. The defence had been that the men came only to exercise religious functions. The usual test question, as to how the prisoners would act in case of a Spanish invasion blessed by papal sanction, had apparently not then been put. It was not till the later stage that Owen agreed to take the oath of supremacy and was reprieved. The other three were drawn to Broyle Heath outside the city, where James and Crockett refused further conference and went to their death; but Edwards yielded either to argument or to the force of circumstances and took the oath on the scaffold when his turn came. Both Owen and

Dealings
with recusant
priests

he subsequently signed three articles promising active allegiance to the queen and repudiating the claim of the pope either to absolve subjects from their allegiance or to allow men by dispensation to take the oath and be bound by it only until he appoint otherwise. These three articles represent very exactly the issues which were involved in all these trials.

The same month saw the submission of William Tedder, and in December he and Tyrrell made their recantation at Paul's Cross; a few months later George Napper made his submission, acknowledging that the queen had all superiority over all her subjects, and denying the right of any foreigner to prejudicate the same: shortly after John Eliot followed suit. In the autumn of 1592 a set of three seminaries changed camp who had been betrayed soon after their advent by one of their fellows turned spy: among them was Thomas Bell, who afterwards became a controversialist of a sort, and was a not unworthy inheritor of the squalid mantle of men like Nichols, Evans, and Tyrrell. The following January saw the submission of Thomas Clark, under the influence of Tedder; and so the list went on increasing as the dealings became more relentless, and under the joint pressure of ecclesiastical conference and excommunication combined with civil prison and torture, the less stout-hearted or less convinced of the seminary men succumbed and returned to the English Church. An appeal was sent out by the archbishop for the support of such men in December 1593. Their number steadily increased and "apostate priests" were among the most energetic of the persecutors.

After 1591 the number of executions diminished, and for the rest of the reign hardly any year had a record half so bloody; but the record of the prisons is almost as hideous as that of the scaffold, and their victims almost as numerous. The prisons were crowded, and the condition of the prisoners varied, often for no other reason than bribes, between the utmost horrors of filth, darkness, and disease on the one hand, and an extraordinary liberty on the other. The life of the prisoners in the Clink with Father Gerard, or in Beaumaris under William Davies, was more like that of an enclosed convent than that of a prison. Great facilities for intercourse and a continual round of religious

and recantations
abound.

Life in
prison.

exercises and services were connived at by the gaolers; visitors from outside came in shoals to be married, confessed, counselled, and communicated. All this freedom the fortunate could have for money; but any one of them was liable, if exceptional circumstances in his case made the government think it desirable, to be haled away to the Tower, and in the torture chamber to suffer agonies worse than death, which might befall him almost equally whether he did or whether he did not consent to betray his friends and incriminate his fellows. Some of the victims stand out from the rest through some special characteristic—James Bird for his youth, for he was but a boy of nineteen; Father Southwell and Father Henry Walpole as being Jesuits, and worthy successors of Campion for their ability and devotion and literary talents; Mistress Line as the third and last woman victim of the reign, who earned her distinction by being the most successful “harbourer of priests.” And the rank and file of the sufferers were characterised by a beautiful piety and simple loyalty to Christ, whose service called them to their perilous task, and whose love supported them in misery and death.

The recusancy laws cause a thrill of horror when they are seen to issue in the executions of people such as these, or of men such as Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry; they formed, however, a part of the political theory of the day on its more merciful side. The character of the penal laws. It must be remembered that the penalty of death was the normal one for offences such as forgery and sheep stealing: also that the policy of the government in tolerating freedom of opinion to all and every man, provided that he maintained an outward conformity, was a real step forward towards liberty of conscience; and it is, to say the least, doubtful whether papists, puritans, or sectaries, if they had had the upper hand, would have gone equally far in the direction of liberty. Still the policy, though in advance of its time, was a wrong one, and the natural effects of it followed. It is not so much the victim as the persecutor that has suffered. Nonconformity gained its liberties, and Romanism, though with much greater difficulty because of its political complexion, at length attained an almost complete emancipation; but the Church suffers still through the disastrous policy of enforcing conformity, and from

the degradation of the idea of churchmanship, which of necessity followed, with regard to both doctrine and practice.

Outside the prisons the hardships went on as before ; in some cases obvious and approved loyalty won some mitigation ; but in general the Recusants at home, who were, as a body, increasingly loyal, had to suffer for the disloyalty of the exiles, who, misled by Parsons, Allen and the rest, did all the mischief and kept out of all the danger. A party had long been forming which was prepared to repel the Spaniard, with whatever amount of papal sanction he might come. Even before the coming of the Armada, it had repudiated the unpatriotism of Allen and the book in which he sought to glorify the treachery of Sir William Stanley in surrendering Deventer to the Spanish forces in the Low Countries. As time went on the breach widened, until there was developed a formal quarrel of considerable magnitude between the party of the Jesuits and the party of the secular clergy.

The palace of the Bishop of Ely at Wisbeach has already been mentioned as the place to which some of the Recusants had been consigned in moments of special danger.

Wisbeach, In the stir caused by the Jesuit invasion in 1580, the first set was sent there, including some of the old Marian leaders, such as Bishop Watson and Abbot Feckenham. The alarm of the Guise conspiracy sent a further batch there in 1583 ; and when the Babington plot was hatched a third set arrived in 1587, including Father Weston, *alias* Edmunds, one of the three Jesuits at that time in the country. On his imprisonment in the previous year the command of the little band had devolved upon Henry Garnet, who had newly arrived with Robert Southwell to reinforce Weston, and in his hands it remained for a long time to come.

Until the new arrivals all at Wisbeach had been harmonious and edifying. In the strictness, or more commonly the laxity, of their prison life, the confessors found opportunities for a regular life of study and devotion ; the faithful outside were edified by what they heard, or even saw of this life, so that they warmly commended and liberally supported the prisoners in their captivity. But the advent of the Jesuit put a new appearance upon the case, and

and the
factions there.

quarrels soon arose and grew. It is difficult to arrive at the facts or the justice of the case ; suffice it to say that a party of secular priests was formed, which complained that Weston wished to rule the rest and get them under his thumb ; while he and his adherents denied this, complained of the laxity of the rival party, and made vague charges against it of "whoredome, drunkenness, and dicing." The crisis came at Christmas 1594, when the Jesuit party, scandalised by the introduction of a hobby-horse among the festivities of the season, withdrew from all intercourse with the seculars. As they numbered about a score to their rivals' dozen, they next claimed the high table for themselves, and drew up a code of laws for the party, forcing the leadership on the well-simulated reluctance of Weston. The seculars, headed by Bluet, who belonged to the original batch of prisoners and had long been their treasurer, resisted these demands ; whereupon the Jesuit party turned the bishop's chapel into a buttery, squabbled about the pewter utensils, and, obtaining the control of most of the supplies, tried to starve the minority into submission.

These "garboyles" were not merely the result of the irritation of the unnatural life of prison. Wisbeach was a microcosm ; and the significance of these squabbles is that they soon gave point and determination to a similar struggle which was on the edge of breaking out in the outside world. In the seminaries abroad there were quite independent reasons for a quarrel between Jesuits and seculars. The English college at Rome, ever since its establishment in 1576, had been beset by contentions arising from the ambition of the Society to control everything, and by the rebellion of the seminarists against their rule.

Similarly in the "English harvest," no sooner had the Jesuits appeared upon the scene than dissensions arose for the same reason. Parsons soon after landing in 1580 spoke speciously to the old Marians and the new seminary priests ; but after his flight abroad in 1581, and the indiscretions of Father Heywood, his successor, it soon became clear that the Jesuits meant to "bring the secular priests' heads under their girdles." The disloyal practisings of Parsons and Allen abroad tended to divide the Recusants of England into two camps, one Spanish and the other English. The Armada

Similar divisions elsewhere, abroad

and at home.

opened the eyes of many, and developed the rift which had already been begun by Cardinal Allen's defence of the treacherous surrender of Deventer. During the remaining years of Allen's life the rift grew; and when the secular leader of the party died on October 6, 1594, the policy became more entirely associated with Parsons and the Jesuit Society,—more especially as it was well known, in spite of his denials, that he was the real author of *The Conference about the Succession*, a book published in 1594 under the pseudonym of Doleman, which urged the claim of a Spanish Infanta to succeed to the English throne.

Thus, not only in the prisons, but in the seminaries and in the larger world, Jesuit and secular were in dispute. The Wisbeach stirs still formed the battle-ground. In November 1594 a reconciliation was effected by the mediation of a trusted secular named Mush, but it barely lasted three months. At the end of 1596 the quarrel was as bad as ever, and the seculars were quite resolute in refusing to accept the appointment by Garnet of Weston to be "agent" over them.

In self-defence they began to organise an association, and to petition Rome for the appointment of a bishop. Parsons, who had hurried to Rome to quell the mutiny against the Society, which had broken out in the English college there, finding the authorities opposed to the creation of a bishop under such circumstances of difficulty and persecution, persuaded Cardinal Caietan, the Protector of the English College, to appoint an archpriest to rule the seculars in England. George Blackwell, who was chosen, was one of Parsons' partisans. All idea of Jesuit control was openly disavowed, but private instructions ordered the archpriest to consult the superior of the Jesuits in important matters. The seculars appealed against this appointment as being irregular and invalid. Their first envoys to Rome were kidnapped by Parsons; their appeal was

leads to fresh quarrels.

scouted, and the appointment was confirmed by a papal brief of April 6, 1599. To this the appellants submitted. Soon, however, finding themselves charged with schism by Blackwell at the instigation of the Jesuits, and called upon to make reparation, they again raised a strong

Jesuit *versus*
secular.

The appoint-
ment of Arch-
priest Black-
well, March
7, 1598.

protest. A new contest ensued. First the University of Paris declared against the charge of schism ; and, when Blackwell tried to suppress the resistance, and suspended Mush and Colleton the leaders, a fresh appeal was made to Rome, dated November 17, 1600, and signed by thirty priests at Wisbeach, where the tension was greater than it had ever been.

By that time the quarrel was notorious. Not only were lay recusants outside obliged to take one or other side in it, and to agree only in deploring its scandals, but it became the mockery of the Anglican preachers, while, so long ago as 1598, it had been taken up by the watchful government, well aware of the importance of deepening the political rift which had come between the dissentients. Strange negotiations took place, in which the Council and the Bishop of London figured on the one side, and the leaders of the secular clergy on the other ; and even from the press a voluminous literature upon the subject began to pour forth. Bluet, after an interview with the Council and the queen, secured that by favour of the government four of the appellants should be "banished," in order that they might promote their appeal at Rome. There, after an abortive brief which settled nothing, the case was at length given a fair hearing, and the appellants, avoiding the treacherous hospitality of Parsons, secured a verdict. The seculars were cleared from the charge of schism, the appointment of the archpriest was confirmed, but he was now no longer ordered but forbidden to consult with Garnet.

The intervention of the government effects a compact, Oct. 1602,

The result was not satisfactory to either party ; the main profit was reaped by the government ; it befriended the appellants till it had all that it required from them. It then issued a new proclamation on November 5, 1602, expressing a desire to distinguish between the two factions, but stating that, however less heinous was the disloyalty of the anti-Spanish party than of the other, they had no reason to look for any "toleration of two religions within the realm." The old rigours of banishment were thereupon rehearsed, and only a small hope was extended of their mitigation. The seculars, who had hoped to purchase some toleration by their professions of loyalty, drew up a solemn protestation of allegiance ; but it never reached Eliza-

but no relief from persecution.

beth, and such effect as it had belongs to the history of her successor.

AUTHORITIES.—Much information as to separatism is gleaned from the literature of the controversies, *e.g.*, Bredwell, *Detection* (1586); *The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownism* (1588); Allison, *Plain confutation of Brownism* (1590).

For Browne, see *u.s.*, and Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* For Barrow, Dexter, *u.s.*; Powicke, *H. Barrow*; Brook, *Lives*; Arber, *Marpelate Controversy*. Cp. Paule, *Life of Whitgift*. Of his writings, the *True Description* is reprinted by Powicke: the rest are not easily accessible. For his trial see *Egerton Papers*. The Examinations of 1586 are reprinted in *Harl. Misc.* iv.

For Hacket and his companions see Cosin, *Conspiracy for pretended Reformation* (1592). For separatism, when it had left England, see Powicke, *u.s.*; Arber, *Pilgrim Fathers*.

The State Papers and Council Acts are full of dealings with recusants. See Morris, *Troubles, u.s.* For Bono and Bayles, see *S.P. Dom.* ccxxx. 104; for the Chichester dealings, ccxvii. x. For Gerard see Morris, *Condition of Catholics*; for Davies see Challoner; for Walpole see Dr. Jessopp, *One Generation of a Norfolk House*. For the Wisbeach troubles see Law, *Jesuits and Seculars*, and *The Archpriest Controversy*; and Taunton, *u.s.*

CHAPTER XVI

THE CLOSING ENCOUNTERS OF THE REIGN WITH PURITANISM

THE chief battle-grounds with puritans were as usual the House of Commons and the Law Courts; but to these must also be added the pulpit, for now the Puritan's weapon was being turned against himself; and the starting-point of a new campaign was the sermon ^{Bancroft's sermon, Feb. 9, 1589,} preached by Bancroft at Paul's Cross on the first Sunday after the parliamentary recess, February 9, 1589. The preacher was a rising man of five-and-forty. Two years previously he had denounced the attack on the Church made by the Puritans in parliament, and he returned again to the charge, having spent the interval in dealing with the Marprelate mystery. His next years were to be full of the same activity, and to be crowned by the victorious issue in 1593 of his two books, called *A Survey of the Pretended Discipline and Dangerous Positions*, which together exposed the principles and practices of puritanism. The sermon was a warning against false prophets, and contained the germ of these later books. The first of four causes which he assigned for the prevalence of false prophets was "contempt of bishops"; and it was his positive assertion of the "superiority of bishops" over other clergy *jure divino*, rather than any violence of attack, that brought the sermon into notoriety.

The controversy had too long been spent upon side issues—mere questions of vestments, of ceremonial usages in the prayer-book, of ecclesiastical courts, etc. The real point at issue was episcopacy ^{raises afresh the doctrine of episcopacy.} *versus* presbyterianism; and if, in some quarters, men had defended episcopacy as being a merely civil delegation

from the Crown, the hollowness of such a position was now to be recognised, and episcopacy was to cease to fight for its existence with such treacherous weapons. For the moment this strong assertion brought reinforcements to the enemy. Many that had been brought up in the exilic traditions of the early years of the reign were presbyterian at heart, but willing to tolerate episcopacy so long as they could delude themselves with the idea that it was no more than a matter of convenience. When their fond delusion was attacked they rallied to the side of the more extreme men.

Sir Francis Knollys, the queen's treasurer, was typical or many. Ever since his return from exile Frankfort or Geneva

Misliked by
many
conformists,
e.g. Sir F.
Knollys.

had been his ideal, but he had tolerated Canterbury. When Whitgift had asserted the doctrine of episcopacy in the official reply to the *Admonition*, he had resented it, but probably had hoped it was one of a number of obnoxious doctrines which would not survive Parker's death. In the disorder of Grindal's days his hopes seemed to be realised, but Whitgift's succession had been a blow. He now found the obnoxious doctrine still alive, being openly reasserted, and the archbishop and the bishop of Winchester supporting it. So Mr. Treasurer wrote wildly to his colleagues to try to persuade them that this was an attack upon the royal supremacy deserving a *præmunire*, and to the puritan leaders to find theological arguments to back his erastian instincts. The bishops were not popular with the politicians, but the Treasurer found little comfort from them. After nagging for more than a year and a half he was brought to a quieter frame of mind by a rebuke from the queen, whose rights he fancied himself to be safeguarding, though he reverted to his grievance with an old man's persistency as the literary war went on upon the subject. In the following year, 1590, there came forward in defence of episcopacy Hadrian Saravia, the Dutch scholar, the first of the band of learned foreigners who were led by their sympathy with the English Reformation to take up their abode in England. Beza attacked it, and Saravia replied; so the lists were more definitely set for what was after all the real central point of the puritan controversy.

The four parliaments of this last period of the reign were marked by a steady *diminuendo* of ecclesiastical interest.

Whitgift pursued a wise policy of anticipating the causes of complaint that were likely to be raised, and of taking steps to deal with them and correct them before parliament met at each session. At the opening of each of the first two the queen renewed her warning to the Commons not to meddle with the affairs of the Church. This did not, however, prevent an attempt being made at each by the puritan party. The attempt of 1589 was an insignificant one, but a more determined effort in 1593 was led by Morice and the archbishop's old antagonist, Beale, and was backed by Knollys, who was still in an erastian and presbyterian frame of mind. This led to a considerable debate before it was quashed by the usual prohibitive message from the queen, which in this case was delivered by the celebrated lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, as Speaker. In 1597 the only attempt was stillborn; and in 1601, though there was much complaint made informally of the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts, no action was taken. Thus the privilege of the Church to initiate such legislation as concerned its own discipline was after a struggle finally established for the time.

Abortive
action of
puritanism in
parliament,
1589, 1593,
1597, 1601.

In certain respects, however, ecclesiastical business was handled in parliament. A bill to restrict pluralities caused a great stir in 1589, and an echo of it was heard later on in 1601. The force of Whitgift's authority was backed by a petition of convocation, and a general outcry on the part of the Church in resisting the bill. The ground of this resistance was that so many benefices by themselves, owing to lay impropriations and other causes, offered no adequate living to the holder, and only one in fifteen had suitable remuneration for a learned and preaching minister. The evils of pluralism thus went on; but convocation took fresh steps to avoid its worst abuses by insisting on some residence in each of the cures held by a double-beneficed man, and on the appointment of a curate when he was non-resident. Later on the queen invited parliament to deal with abuses that grew up through marriage licenses; but a bill that was introduced on the subject in November 1597 came to nothing. Meanwhile the reforms made by convocation were considerable. A new code of

Ecclesiastical
business
successfully
handled
only in
convocation.

canons emerged in 1597—an enlargement of the previous set of 1585. These were again insisted on at the next convocation in 1601, and finally prepared the way for the great code of canons of the next reign in 1604.

In the law courts the struggle with puritanism entered on a period of severity at the end of 1589. Papers were found in the study of a minister named Wright which revealed the alarming growth and organisation in recent years of the conspiracy to substitute the presbyterian discipline for the system of the Church. Early in the year following, John Johnson, another puritan minister who had been censured by the *classis* at Northampton, came forward to add to the revelations. The authorities were now able to trace out the systematic way in which the propaganda had been carried out in various districts, and especially in the Midlands.

The unravelling of presbyterian conspiracy.

The ecclesiastical commissioners first laid hands upon Edmund Snape, the leader at Northampton, and confronted him with thirty-six interrogations based on the evidence received. He refused to take the oath or answer, and was sent to prison in April 1590. The letters that he sent to warn others were intercepted. A month later a number of others had come forward to give evidence, and after receiving their depositions in May 1590, the archbishop wrote to the Lord Treasurer giving an account of the system of *classes* and synods by which the movement was worked, recounting how these assemblies had declared against the dumb ministry, episcopal ordination and government, the oath *ex officio*, etc., and bringing special charges against Snape for mutilating the prayer-book services, for refusing to baptise a child "Richard" because it was not a biblical name, for renouncing his episcopal ordination in favour of a "calling" from the *classis*, etc.

Dealings with Snape

Meanwhile Cartwright, Snape's old colleague, had been sent for from Warwick. The leadership had, in fact, passed somewhat out of his hands, and for the last five years he had in his own estimation kept quiet and clear of controversy, though he had been summoned by his bishop for preaching without license, and even when suspended had gone on preaching as before. His appearance

and Cartwright

was delayed till the autumn by his ill-health. Meanwhile further revelations were made, by Mr. Stone in particular, and a dozen others who had been more or less prominent in the movement. When at last the articles were propounded to him, on October 8, 1590, he refused several times to answer upon the oath *ex officio*, and went quietly to the Fleet prison.

The controversy over that oath now reached its height, and was carried on with warmth between ecclesiastical lawyers headed by Dr. Cosin, and civil lawyers headed by Morice. The former amply justified the use of it so far as precedent was concerned, for it was the ancient ecclesiastical practice that when the ordinary proceeded against a person under his jurisdiction *ex officio mero*—that is, taking the initiative which is incumbent on him as being responsible for ecclesiastical discipline, and not sitting as judge to decide between accuser and accused—the person proceeded against should have the opportunity of clearing himself by an oath of purgation. The whole of this ecclesiastical procedure was based upon the assumption of a spiritual relation rather than a judicial one between judge and accused. It was entirely misunderstood by the civilians that opposed it, to whose minds, trained in a fundamentally different school of law, it seemed like the attempt on the part of a judge, presumed to be impartial, to make a prisoner implicate himself. And they had this justification, that in the ecclesiastical courts the spiritual and parental relations no longer existed which had originated such a procedure and could alone justify its continuance.

The controversy, however, was not to be merely a literary one. The opponents of the oath had desired the question to be referred to the judges, and they had their desire. The charges against the disciplinarians together with the whole case were submitted to the chief justices and the law officers of the Crown, with the result that they recommended, on February 3, 1591, a prosecution in the court of Star Chamber and a sentence of banishment as the most suitable penalty for such intolerable disobedience. Cartwright, Snape, and some half a dozen other leaders appeared in consequence in the Star Chamber on May 13. The charges against them included the holding of unlawful and seditious

lead to fresh
quarrels
about the
oath
ex officio.

The decision
of the lawyers
in its favour

assemblies, the subscription of the Book of Discipline, the use of a new form of common prayer, the slandering of the prayer-book and episcopate, besides their more recent contumacies in refusing the oath, and in getting up an agitation to secure their release from prison. Again they refused to give proper answers to the bill exhibited against them, and even when the chief justices decided once more that answer must be given, they refused still. They were then sent back to the ecclesiastical commission to take the oath and stand the inquiry.

It would no doubt have been better if, when once the legality of the procedure had been established, the use of it had been waived; but it was too much to expect

mitigated by
Whitgift's
action.

lawyers to modify their procedure or to recognise that it was unsuitable to the conditions of the case.

The quarrel thus dragged on, centering more round the oath than the specific charges. Cartwright held out against the commission, though pressed hard by the attorney-general and Bancroft; and in spite of a petition from James, King of Scotland, in their favour, the captives remained in prison, deprived and degraded. A petition to the Council of December 4 caused Burghley to reconsider their case and consult the attorney-general, but his answer was unfavourable. Various attempts were made to come to terms. The inquiry in the Star Chamber court had not revealed acts that could be construed as seditious; but the prisoners refused to sign the submission that was prepared for them when they moved the archbishop for deliverance, and so they were refused bail (February 1592). They had some mitigation of the strictness of their confinement granted at the beginning of the year, and in April they were able to make an appeal to the queen. Eventually they owed their enlargement to the archbishop, who throughout had stood aside as far as possible from the proceedings in the commission, for fear that he might be thought, at any rate in Cartwright's case, to be a partial judge, and who seems to have retained all through a generous appreciation of the great learning and high character of his old antagonist, and to have rejoiced in an opportunity of merciful intervention.

The state of things revealed in this way was a truly strange

one. The puritan clergy had been managing their parishes according to the provisions of the *Book of Discipline*, to which many of them had bound themselves by a formal subscription, and in defiance of the discipline of the Church of which they were ministers. They had been taking their commission from the presbyterian bodies and not from the bishops, except as a matter of legal form, and their directions from the *classes* and rival synods and not from convocation. They had used only such parts of the rites of the Church as they pleased, worn what they pleased, preached as they pleased, done what they pleased, and depraved everything with which they were displeased; yet they still continued to occupy the rooms and take the revenues of the Church, while they pledged themselves to seek to pervert its government. The puritan conscience was somehow able to justify what the conscience of the loyal churchman and the sectary alike condemned, and public opinion to a very large extent encouraged it. For there was quite sufficient of real earnestness and obvious grievance on the side of the persecuted, and of grave laxity and open scandal on the side of the persecutor, to blur the real issues, and to condone in the eyes of many a position which in itself was inherently dishonest.

With the release of Cartwright the great battle ended; and for the rest of the reign little went on but skirmishing. One such encounter needs special mention, for through it an important legal decision was given. Robert Cawdray, parson of South Luffenham in Rutlandshire, had been in trouble ever since December 1586 for a sermon in which he spoke against the prayer-book, calling it a vile book. On account of this and for other causes, he was first suspended by Bishop Aylmer and the ecclesiastical commission; and when he persisted in refusing to retract his words or to conform to the book, he was finally deprived on May 30, 1587. He remained defiant, refused to wear the surplice on the ground that he had never yet done so, and made fresh appeals for help to Burghley, who had appointed him to the benefice sixteen years before. The Lord Treasurer supported him at first, but he soon found him unlearned and impracticable, and appointed a successor named Bayley. But when, after further delays made in hope

The puritan
disloyalty.

Cawdray's
case estab-
lishes the old
canon law.

of Cawdray's conformity, Bayley was at last instituted by the Bishop of Peterborough, Cawdray kept him out, threatened him, threshed his corn, and refused to give way to him: at the same time he enlarged the sphere of his ecclesiastical enormities by collecting people in his house and reading Marprelate literature to them with closed doors. Attempts at mediation by Whitgift proved fruitless. In May 1589 he was again convicted by the commissioners for withstanding the former sentence, and for a whole year longer useless negotiations and piteous appeals went on. In May 1590 Cawdray took his case into the Star Chamber, and the commissioners replied by passing a long-threatened sentence of degradation against him. The appeal to the civil court brought in the civilians, Morice with Fuller and others; and in spite of the fact that this last blow had been dealt with the co-operation of some of the Privy Council and the judges, they set to work to find legal flaws in the original sentence of the commission. Apparently it was no difficult task, and amid much argument the proceedings dragged on until ultimately, in June 1591, the whole case was argued before all the judges. They held with the ecclesiastical lawyers against Cawdray's counsel Morice, the attorney of the Court of Wards, that though it was true that Aylmer's sentence was not in accordance with the Act of Uniformity, yet it was open to him and to the ecclesiastical commissioners to proceed by the old ecclesiastical law and not by the new statute law, if it seemed good; and that this being so, the original sentence must be judged to be valid. Thus the authority of the ecclesiastical law was vindicated, and the right of ecclesiastical courts to proceed upon it even in matters which were touched by statute law. Cawdray had a last chance of conformity given him by Whitgift in the ensuing November; he refused it and disappeared into obscurity.

It is somewhat a relief to turn from disciplinary jangles to disputes about doctrine, even though they concern such inscrutable points as freewill and predestination. Hitherto much English theology had been dominated by the commanding influence of Calvin, but the last years of the century witnessed the beginnings of a rebellion. At Cambridge there had for some time been a marked divergence of opinion between Whitaker the

✓
Rebellion
against
Calvinistic
doctrine at
Cambridge

Regius and Baro the Margaret professor of divinity. Baro, though a Frenchman, and ordained originally by Calvin himself, had receded from his master's extreme views; and ever since 1581 mutterings of a coming storm had been heard. It broke out actually through a sermon preached for his B.D. degree in 1595 by William Barrett, one of the new school of rising Cambridge theologians. He denied the certainty of assurance and final perseverance, and asserted against Calvin, and not without strictures on him and other favourite names, that sin alone is the cause of reprobation. To the extreme Calvinist this was a "popish doctrine," and Barrett was forced to make a recantation, which only added fuel to the flames. The archbishop, and Burghley as chancellor of the university, were soon involved in it as well as the rival professors. Whitgift showed himself to be to a considerable extent on Barrett's side, and condemned the university authorities for their mismanagement of the case; but after many negotiations he heard the case with the help of some of the Cambridge authorities, condemned Barrett on certain points, and drew up a new recantation for him.

If matters had ended here, all would have been well; but in the hope of allaying controversy the archbishop adopted, though not without considerable modifications in the liberal direction, a set of nine articles which Whitaker had drawn up; and he sent them to Cambridge with an order that they were to be accepted as a standard of teaching. Whitaker did not live to see the trouble caused by his handiwork, but the archbishop found that he had only added to the disputes instead of ending them. Baro was almost at once in trouble for his attitude toward these new Lambeth articles; the queen was angry with Whitgift for presuming to issue them on his own responsibility, and with Baro also for causing a stir against them. When the professor's case was submitted to the archbishop, he accepted his explanations and continued him in office. Whitaker was succeeded by Overall, one of the younger men and of the opposite school; and these Lambeth articles, instead of perpetuating the Calvinist views, marked, in fact, the beginning of their decay. They were soon practically withdrawn, and when, in 1604, the Puritans sought to have them set alongside

leads to the
Lambeth
articles.

of the articles of religion, it was Whitaker's successor who checkmated the attempt.

This is but one evidence of the transformation which was going on quietly in the last decade of the century, and was to show itself more plainly in the next. Theology had taken a new turn, with Hooker at Oxford and Andrewes and Overall at Cambridge as its leaders. These men not only led the revulsion against dominant Calvinism, but introduced a more mature conception of the position of the English Church, based upon the appeal to Scripture and the principles of the undivided Church. The earlier theologians had been able to recognise in principle the soundness of this appeal, but they had not hitherto been able to work out in practice its detailed results.

Simultaneously the era of spiritual exhaustion which had begun with the reign was passing away. The practice of religion had sunk to a very low ebb as the standard of decency in worship and efficiency in clerical ministrations had gone down. There had been a moment when hatred of Spain and Rome seemed to be the only bit of religion left in the English Church. Now the signs of renewed life began to reappear; the decay of churches had marked the earlier days, but in the last years of the reign church restoration began, and was encouraged by a vigorous letter from Whitgift of June 21, 1602. Church adornment followed suit, and even church building, for the archbishop set the example by the erection of the chapel of his foundation at Croydon, which was dedicated by the Bishop of London, July 10, 1599. In the middle period organs were being ejected, chapels changed into pews, and galleries built for the congregation. The churches had thus changed their appearance greatly, though not so much as has often been supposed. The early years of the seventeenth century saw much in the way of restoration and embellishment, and it was left to a later generation to pull down the screens, smash the painted windows, and demolish the cherubims in the elaborate roofs.

As regards church attendance, daily services had soon almost ceased with the reintroduction of the prayer-book; the communion service had receded more and more into the

background in defiance of the book, and bishops had grown very remiss in confirming and ordaining. But now daily services were again beginning, and if communion was still largely in abeyance except to satisfy the requirements of the law, there were signs of the recovery of more frequent opportunities and more devout reception. Confession also, which likewise had been in abeyance, was now beginning again. It is difficult to trace the extent of so private an ordinance, but Hooker's use of it upon his death-bed is notorious, and set an example that was striking. The issue of devotional books tells the same story. They were rare in the earlier part of the reign, but came out in increasing quantity in the later. Curiously enough, one of the most popular was Bunny's adaptation of the anonymous Romanist manual called the Christian Directory, which was due to the hand of no less a person than the Jesuit Parsons himself. Thus on all sides there were hopeful signs of a revival.

The death of the queen marked a real epoch—not in the spiritual life of the Church, for she seemed all through to be untouched by the spiritual realities of religion—but on the ecclesiastical side. In this sphere she had been a real nursing mother to the Church, and her instinct for government and her sense of the place of the Church in relation to the State had carried it through many a difficulty and danger. When her strong hand was gone, its troubles speedily multiplied, and in spite of the growing spiritual recovery, its ecclesiastical position became more than ever the subject of hatred and attack from men professing godliness.

The death of
Elizabeth,
March 24,
1603.

For Bancroft's attack on the Puritans' action in Parliament see *S.P. Dom.* cxcix. 1. His sermon is in Hickes, *Tracts*.

For Knollys' protests see *S.P. Dom.* ccxxiii., ccxxxiii., Lansd. MSS., and Strype. For the exposure of presbyterianism see Bancroft, *u.s.*; Heylyn, *History of Presbyterianism*; Fuller, *u.s.* For Cartwright see Brook, *Lives*; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and the Lansd. MSS. lxvi.-lxix.

For Cawdray see Strype, *Aylmer*; Brook; Coke, *Reports*, v., and Lansd. MSS. liii.-lxviii.

For the Lambeth Articles see Hardwick, *History of the Articles*.

CHAPTER XVII

THE NEW DYNASTY

At Elizabeth's death the great question of the succession, which had been so hotly debated for over forty years, was soon settled in the coolest fashion, for James stepped to the throne as quietly as if he were the only possible claimant, in spite of the fact that *The Book of the Succession* had reckoned up no less than "five particular houses that pretend the crowne of England," and a vast host of individual pretenders. Most of these existed merely in the fertile brain of Parsons, and were introduced into the book only to make a parade of impartiality, just as the religious question was there treated with an appearance of aloofness, though every one knew well, and no one better than Parsons, that it was that and nothing else which lay at the root of the whole matter. Since the day when its prospects had changed with the death of the Scottish queen, there had been times when the papal party had set high hopes upon her son, but since the new century began it had ceased to expect much from that quarter. The briefs which the pope sent in advance calling upon his adherents to welcome none but a Roman catholic as Elizabeth's successor, and the hopes which had grown larger and larger in the minds of the schemers abroad and their allies in England, alike had a Spanish successor in view. But when the moment came the briefs vanished into the fire and the hopes into thin air : the Stewart dynasty had begun.

James's success was due to the middle position which he occupied. The patriots among the Romanists had not for-

A peaceful
succession,
March 24,
1603.

gotten the first Armada of 1588, nor its successor of 1596. Recent events had made them an organised party, and they were hoping, not without some reason, that James's advent would bring them more toleration. If the puritan party had been gifted with prophecy it might have had good reasons of its own for wishing for another king than James; but the godly ministers who wrote congratulations to him in Scotland and waited upon him at York with their welcome had not realised the disgust which had been created in his mind by the presbyterian system in his own country, and most of them fondly imagined that they would bask in his favour. James, however, as the result of his Scottish experience, had acquired a wish for an administrative episcopacy, together with a horror of the two ideas which we should now call in their more full-blown state and in our modern language clericalism and democracy; and he was perspicacious enough to see a large ingredient of each of them in the presbyterian system, and to suspect it accordingly. He did not want his action to undergo the scrutiny of either an ecclesiastical or a popular body. The days had come when kings, too weak to rule by their own power, would seek to do so by an exaggerated claim of divine right. The presbytery, therefore, which made the same claim was to James a suspected rival.

The reasons
of James's
welcome.

Conciliation, however, was congenial to him; and it was the first note of the new reign as soon as James was on the scene. Till then the old rigour was kept up, and in April the Council was prepared to torture a man who had talked big about the advent of toleration of the Romanists. All this soon changed. James hoped to find the Presbyterians in England less bigoted and troublesome than those whom he left behind, and the Recusants more favourable to a newcomer than they could be to one who had so long been the incarnation of their troubles and the object of their plots as Elizabeth had been. To the move of the pope, in sending the two briefs in favour of a Roman catholic successor, he had replied by giving assurances of his adherence to the reformed religion; but he had spoken kindly words to the lay recusants who presented their petition to him at his first coming, asking at least for the exercise of

The first signs
of concilia-
tion

their religion in private, on the ground of their loyalty, their efforts to secure James's succession, their past sufferings, and the venerable and continuous character of their religion.

In a very short time, however, kindness had to give way to severity. Two plots were discovered, one still immature, the other nearly ripe but crackbrained; the latter are checked by the discovery of plots, was the work of William Watson, one of the secular priests, and it was revealed to the government by the Recusants themselves. The other was more obscure in its history, though more distinguished in its adherents, and included others besides recusants. James was naturally puzzled. In themselves the plots were bound to dispose him unfavourably towards the Recusants; but this feeling was checked by the fact that the Recusants themselves, Gerard the Jesuit and Blackwell the archpriest, had disclosed the "Bye Plot" of Watson. Still it was possible that the heads of the Jesuit party had only disclosed the "Bye Plot" because they had no love for the secular priests who were concerned in it, or because they were more interested in the "Main Plot" which had been engineered by Lord Cobham, or because they had other fish to fry. These circumstances made the king hesitate to carry out his promise of remitting the recusancy fines; but, after a conference on July 17 with a deputation of loyal recusants, he settled to forbear at any rate the collection of the fine of £20 per month levied on the gentry for non-attendance at church.

Meanwhile the investigation of the threads of the two conspiracies went on, and November saw the climax of each of the inquiries. Watson, with Clarke, his fellow-priest, and a layman, were executed for their share and by their suppression. in the one. For their part in the other, "the Main Plot," Lord Cobham and Lord Grey were convicted by their peers, and Sir Walter Raleigh by a body of commissioners specially appointed to try him. Negotiations with Spain had undoubtedly been going on, but none were brought conclusively home to the door of any of the three men convicted. They were therefore sent to the Tower; but no one could feel that the smouldering fire had really been discovered and stamped out.

James was still anxious to be tolerant, so far as he

could be without encouraging an increase of recusancy. But toleration would only be possible if some distinction could be made between the loyal and the disloyal; to this problem, therefore, he turned his attention. His attitude to the laity was very different from that to the clergy, for these, in consequence of their foreign training, were more suspected of disloyalty, and even when they were loyal, their missionary zeal represented to him the increase of recusancy that he wished to avoid. He went so far as to negotiate with Rome in order to secure the furtherance of his policy. The response was naturally a negative one. Rome was not prepared to regard its adherents as a dwindling minority, even in order to secure toleration for them. Moreover, at the moment they were very much the contrary. Since James's accession priests had poured into England, and since the relaxation of the penalties a large body of people had come over to them. A number of priests had been pardoned and released; signatures to the "Catholiques' Supplication" were being openly gathered; the hopes of the Recusants and their numbers alike were rising high and their boasts sounding loud.

In the autumn the returns of the dioceses came in, giving an estimate of their numbers, as part of the response to a general inquiry instituted by the archbishop. They revealed such a large body of recusants of all classes as could not fail to disquiet the inquirers; moreover, it is evident that at any rate in some districts a large proportion of those returned as recusant or non-communicant had become so since the death of Elizabeth, in hope of a new dispensation, in which the terrors of the penal laws would be mitigated. In the diocese of Durham they amounted to 526, as against over 67,000 communicants of the English Church; of these only fifty were persons of any account. It was, however, an increase of sixty per cent on the small number that remained at the end of Elizabeth's reign, and that was serious enough. Other dioceses had larger figures: Chester with 2442 headed the list, and York followed with 720. Lichfield alone among dioceses of the southern province compared with those of the north, having 231 men and 419 women. The sum total was still quite inconsiderable—only

8570, or less than one for every parish; while the communicants were over $2\frac{1}{4}$ millions—that is, over 250 for every parish. The claim, therefore, that in James's first year the Recusants increased by 10,000 was as ludicrous as many another estimate of the same character.

The force with which the law had pressed upon consciences is illustrated by a statement in the York return that Matthew

Haigh received the bread, but put it into his book
as the pressure upon them lessens. instead of consuming it, and took the wine only into his mouth and did not drink it. Such shifts

—for this statement does not stand alone—were enough to condemn the whole system of driving men to communion; but this was not the deduction drawn from them by the men of the time. To the government this revelation seemed to be only a call for greater rigour; it was all the more so interpreted inasmuch as the Recusants became increasingly aggressive and their opponents in the north went daily in fear of their lives. Consequently, as the prospect of his first English parliament drew near, James felt the need of showing some evidence of the repressive side of his policy towards the priests to match his concessions to the laity.

A proclamation was issued on February 22, 1604, which, after complaining that Jesuits and seminaries, "upon a vain

confidence of some innovations in matters of
Repressive proclamation against them, Feb. 22, 1604, religion to be made" by the king, go about saying masses and seducing people from the religion

established, ordered them all, whether they were at large or in prison, to quit the kingdom before the date of the assembly of parliament. Of greater interest than this—the main purport of the proclamation—is its tone in other respects. Those subjects that "call themselves catholics" are not to feel disappointed, for this is not a change of policy but a necessary consequence of recent conspiracies and of the conduct of men who are bound to obey a foreign authority. We are personally much beholden to the pope; but his claim to dispose of kingdoms and dispense subjects from their obedience is subversive of all government, and there will be no security till a general council has declared against it. It was a new language to a generation which had been accustomed to regard "Antichrist" as the natural synonym

for the pope, and to confuse all the relations with Rome in one unreasoning hatred. Here was an attempt to discriminate between loyal and disloyal and between the clergy and laity, and to distinguish between the thankworthy and the blame-worthy parts of the papal policy. Though the edict was punitive it opened up new prospects that the quarrel might, after all, be ended, at any rate on its political side.

To the clergy so banished, however, the document had a sinister sound. After its publication in the North a very pathetic protest was found pinned up at Wigan Cross; it recounted on behalf of the seminaries ^{raises a protest.} how, after all their past sufferings and new hopes, they had trusted that "some little gale of kingly favour would have blown upon their distressed and weather-beaten sails"; but seeing that persecution was renewed, they demanded a disputation to decide whether they deserved all this for no other crime than their priesthood and religion; they undertook to prove recusants to be more worthy subjects than any; if they failed to prove this they would gladly endure banishment or any other penalty, but if they succeeded they modestly would claim only some part of what was due to them. So, with an appeal to God's highest tribunal for justice, and a prayer that God would mitigate wrath meanwhile and give them patience to endure for the Lord, the pathetic appeal ended. In truth it deserved a better fate than to be plucked down, sent to the Council, and then buried in the archives unheeded.

In his dealings with the Puritans the king showed much less consideration. There were three divergent views of this party as seen from outside. Whitgift and his followers, looking at it from the point of view of ^{Three views of puritanism.} the traditional church principles, saw in it a number of people many of whom were trying to pull down the historic catholic apostolic Church of God's ordinance and set up a new presbyterian body in its place; however much, therefore, he sympathised with many of its real grievances, he could not but resist its policy with all his power. Bacon may be taken as the best representative of those who regarded it from the political point of view, and who had not much insight as to the importance of those Church

principles, which were really the points at stake, although to all appearance the fight was about trivial matters. These saw in the puritan party a body of earnest men, who had many real grievances mixed up with somewhat minute and tiresome scruples, and who, having attracted to themselves a large section of the best religious people of the time, deserved rather to be met and conciliated than to be repressed and silenced. The *Considerations touching the better pacification and edification of the Church of England* which Bacon placed in the king's hands at his first coming, though lacking in penetration, were full of the right spirit of conciliation. While maintaining stoutly the episcopal and historical hierarchy, he wished to see more liberty in church polity, but he wisely abstained from anything but generalities, which sounded well, but were useless. On other points he was more explicit, and his recommendations to restrict the absolutism of bishops, to increase the power of convocation, to restore the prophesyings as training grounds for preachers, and to reform the tenure of benefices and endowments, deserved more attention than they secured. James's point of view, as has been already shown, was neither of these; it agreed with the latter in being based on political, not ecclesiastical considerations, but with the former in being adverse to puritanism.

It was a very moderate section of that party with which he was first brought into contact, and a very moderate set of demands that came to him, in the form of the The Millenary petition, April 1603. Millenary petition, on his way to London in April. The thousand ministers whose desires it claimed to set forth disclaimed any revolutionary views; they said nothing about the presbytery, or the essential equality of ministers, or the Holy Discipline, or the old platform of Cartwright and Travers, but they begged for redress in four classes of abuses. First they rehearsed the stock objections to the prayer-book,—the crossing at baptism, the ring at marriage, the reading of the Apocrypha, baptism by women, and so forth, with a number of less definite points. Next they demanded that dumb ministers should be removed, or that at least some provision should be made in their parishes for preachers; and that no subscription should be demanded other than that imposed by act of parliament to the articles and to the royal supremacy.

Thirdly, they dealt with endowments, condemning pluralities and demanding *inter alia* for the support of preachers the restoration of a sixth or a seventh part of the lay impropriations. Fourthly, they desired that some enormities which degraded the administration of discipline, such as excommunication by lay officials and for "trifles and twelve-penny matters," should be redressed, some popish canons be reversed, procedure be expedited, marriage licenses be more cautiously granted, and the oath *ex officio* be more sparingly used.

These demands, and especially those under the last heading, were surprisingly moderate. It is true that in some respects there were false charges, because the reforms of the canons of 1597 were not taken into account; but Its moderate character. at any rate, except in regard to the stock grievances of the prayer-book, there was now little trace of that pettiness that had often hitherto spoiled puritan protests. All the other matters were, to say the least, well worthy of consideration; many were points that ought to have secured the goodwill of all who had the best interests of the Church at heart, though not a few were bound to prove impracticable.

Another paper of less publicity but of greater fullness followed in the main the same lines. This "Memorial of abuses to be reformed by king or parliament" first enumerated fifteen points of civil policy, and then A memorial of abuses. recounted sixteen things grievous and offensive in the Church of England. It added to the ritual grievances a protest against the ceremony of "touching" for the king's evil; it made fuller protest against moral corruption, simony, sabbath-breaking, and lax morality in high places; it demanded harsher dealings with recusants, and protested at the way in which their fines were farmed to courtiers so that the exchequer received less than £4000 out of a total of £13,595.

James was favourably impressed, and was inclined to agree to the conference for which the petitioners asked. Those, however, who knew better the nature of English puritanism were not slow to think that they detected Favourable first impressions the cloven hoof of the presbyterian conspiracy under this innocent garb. To them the petition seemed to be the thin end of the disciplinarian wedge; it was not an unnatural view, and was soon shown to be a true one; but it would

have been better if there could have been some more generous recognition of the moderation of the petitioners so long as it lasted.

Unfortunately, having presented the petition, with the extravagant claim that it represented the wishes of 1000 ministers, the promoters went about to gather adherents to it *ex post facto*; and the form of subscription which they sent round in June sounded a more threatening chord. The petitioners were to ask for further reform "according to the rule of God's Holy Word and agreeable to the example of other reformed churches which have restored both the doctrine and discipline as it was delivered by our Saviour Christ and His holy Apostles." The cloven hoof was thus revealed. The procedure, too, was characteristic, and it forfeited for them the favourable reception which the petition itself might otherwise have had.

Consequently the universities vied with one another in opposing the petition. Cambridge, in spite of its puritan sympathies, had already early in the day met it by a formal resolution to degrade from his status any who publicly opposed the doctrine or discipline of the Church. Later, when the petition was made more public and the agitation had grown, Oxford was first in the field in issuing a detailed reply to it and to the designs that lay behind it; while Cambridge, giving up the answer that it had projected, contented itself with publishing its former resolution. The Oxford tract dealt systematically and unsympathetically with the petition, answered its objections, and showed up the false statements to which it had imprudently committed itself as to enormities in the matter of excommunication.

On the other side the petition was more generally disseminated as part of a wide propaganda, and other similar documents were circulated in various quarters. *A complaint in the name of the meaner sort of the laity* was, to the great indignation of Whitgift and Bancroft, got up by a man in the diocese of Chichester who had been refused ordination, and who had since crowned a sordid career with bankruptcy and excommunication. Another attempt in the same diocese to move the better sort of gentle-

are subsequently marred.

The hostility of the universities.

Further petitions.

folk was less successful ; but the infection spread until the king was "daily troubled with clamorous petitions." Some Hertfordshire puritans were even ill-advised enough to interrupt the king's hunting with one ; and, not to be behind the rest, even the Family of Love, a wild sect of mystic sectaries that had maintained an obscure existence in England for fifty years and more, caught the infection, and set out its case in a petition of its own. Thus it became increasingly clear that a pitched battle was imminent between the authorities and the nonconformists.

The king had already begun to take steps on his own account to meet some of the grievances : he had written to the universities with regard to the supply of preaching ministers and the restoration of impropriate tithe, promising to inaugurate the restoration himself, and urging the universities, as holders of a large amount of impropriate tithes, to follow suit. On the following day the archbishop protested to the king that such restoration would ruin the universities, and so defeat the object in view, viz. the supply of a learned ministry. The archbishop had continually been labouring to that end. He had recently instituted an inquiry into the state of the parishes with regard to pluralists and preachers, which showed results that were fairly satisfactory, inasmuch as more than half the benefited clergy were preachers and the cases of pluralism had been reduced to an average of one in ten. Naturally, therefore, he looked in other directions for the further improvement of clerical efficiency, and both he and his brother primate Matthew Hutton, who had been translated in 1595 from Durham to York, were opposed to any scheme for the restoration of the alienated tithe. Another episcopal protest was evoked by the action of the king in pardoning a nonconforming divine named Charnock ; while Whitgift and Bancroft, now Bishop of London, assailed Cecil with complaints of factious clergy.

Soon a proclamation, dated October 24, 1603, announced that a conference was to be held by the king with the Council and divers of the bishops and other learned men, but that owing to the plague it would be deferred until the new year ; it condemned meanwhile the

The king's
first steps

lead up to a
conference

signing of supplications, contempt of the ecclesiastical courts and system, and all factious manner of proceeding by those who "under pretended zeal affect novelty." Simultaneously the king made a further attempt to deal with the grievance about the clergy, and wrote to the two archbishops asking for detailed information as to their number and quality; he promised to make up the revenues from inappropriate tithes, but called for the suppression of novelties, and in particular of new forms, not prescribed by authority, for the celebration of divine service and of the sacrament which were being introduced.

On Saturday, January 14, the king began his conference at Hampton Court with the privy council, the bishops who

at Hampton
Court, Jan.
14, 1604. had been summoned, nine in number, and five deans. He had three subjects for discussion: two

were obvious, viz. the prayer-book, and the practice of excommunication; but the third was an unexpected topic, viz. the provision of clergy for Ireland. The greater part of three or four hours was spent over the first, and in particular over confirmation, absolution, and private baptism; the bishops gave an exposition of their case to the king, and the upshot was that in each respect it was felt that some small change of words might be devised to meet the case—to explain the first two to those who misunderstood them, and to restrict the normal administration of baptism to the clergy.

On the following Monday the four representatives of the petitioners—Reynolds, Dean of Lincoln, Spark, Knewstubs, and

The second
day's meeting
with the
Puritans,
Jan. 16. Chaderton—confronted the king with two delegates from the bishops and some other doctors. Reynolds, their spokesman, had four headings to bring forward—purity of doctrine, the ministry, the reform of

Church government, and the amendment of the prayer-book. Addressing himself to the first, he complained of some points in the Articles of Religion, and had not accomplished more than three of his nine topics under this heading when he was roughly interrupted by Bancroft, whose hasty temper refused to listen to this criticism of the liturgy and of the discipline established. The episcopal outburst was rebuked by the king, but Reynolds paused to have his first points discussed before proceeding to the rest. Much argument there-

upon ensued about the ministry, the rite of confirmation, and the doctrine of predestination, in which connexion Reynolds had asked for incorporation with the Thirty-nine Articles the nine Lambeth "assertions orthodoxal." When his further points were reached they were found less controversial, and two of them—the demands for an enlargement of the Catechism and for a new translation of the Bible—were destined speedily to bear fruit.

The question of the ministry was next handled ; and, while all agreed that a preaching ministry was desirable if it could be had, the king recounted his own attempts to facilitate this end, and Bancroft called attention to other parts of the pastoral office, and in particular to the need of a praying minister, who would administer the sacraments and absolve the penitent rather than be content with pulpit labours, and those not always discreet or charitable. This protest was an appropriate reminder, but it long rankled in the minds of those whose highest words of commendation were to call a minister "a powerful preacher."

Questions of
ministry.

Then Reynolds came to his fourth heading, and defined the reasons why his friends disliked or refused subscription to the prayer-book : the cross, the ring, the Apocrypha, the churching of women were the points at issue. Again it was clear that the Puritans had dropped many of their grievances ; and when the king expressly asked their opinion of that old bone of contention, the square cap, the representatives all approved it. Finally, Reynolds handled disciplinary questions—abuses of excommunication, the revival of the prophesyings in ruridecanal chapters, and so forth ; but in proposing that debatable points should be referred first to the archdeacon's visitation, and then to the bishop sitting in synod with his presbytery, they touched upon a sore point in James' mind. The word "presbytery" was a word of ill omen, and James, after lecturing them on the royal supremacy and on his favourite text, "No bishop no king," closed the day's conference, remarking as he went, "If this be all they have to say, I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse."

Liturgy and
discipline.

A day passed, and on Wednesday, January 18, the king

met the bishops and divines, with whom were now associated the leading ecclesiastical lawyers; and the archbishop produced the schedule of the four proposed explanatory alterations in the prayer-book. Then followed considerable discussion of the ecclesiastical commission and its working, especially in dioceses where there was a local commission appointed. A peer brought up against Whitgift the *ex officio* oath and Burghley's old letter, which compared it to the Inquisition. The archbishop made some explanations and corrections on the matter, while the Lord Chancellor and Treasurer defended the practice, and the king made such a summing up in its favour as led the obsequious courtiers to protest that he "spake by the special assistance of God's Spirit." After a review of the other points at issue the puritan champions were called in, and the changes in the prayer-book were read and expounded to them. These they could only accept with as good grace as they could muster; but two of them asked that the surplice and cross in baptism might not be forced upon certain honest and godly ministers of their acquaintance in Lancashire and Suffolk respectively, because they would lose credit with their flocks by compliance. They obtained no such exemption for their friends, but only a period of delay in which to bring themselves to conformity. Finally, with a censure upon those who communicated sitting or "ambling,"—that is, passing along the rails, the conference concluded. It was left to commissioners to carry its decisions into effect.

Those which concerned the prayer-book were first disposed of: it was easy to arrange for the alteration of the rubric of private baptism, of the title prefixed to the absolution and to the confirmation service, of the opening words of two of the gospels: the modification of the table of lessons so as to exclude certain passages from the Apocrypha offered little difficulty; while the way for the most substantial change, viz. the addition of the section about the sacraments to the church catechism, had already been prepared by Nowell's Catechism, issued in 1570; and Overall, his successor in the deanery of St. Paul's, had no heavy task in abbreviating and amending it for the new purpose. The changes were prepared by the commissioners

The third
day,
Jan. 18.

The results
seen in the
prayer-book
changes.

and authorised by royal letters-patent of February 9 as explanatory alterations, under the general authority of the prerogative of the Crown and the special section of the Act of Uniformity, which authorised the publishing of further ceremonies or rites by the Crown in conjunction with ecclesiastical commissioners or the metropolitan. It needed some stretching of terms to cover such additions and changes, especially as the opportunity was taken to insert also a number of prayers and thanksgivings wholly unconnected with the points at issue; but the king was glad to magnify his prerogative; the bishops were glad to get matters settled and to defer a synodical approbation till it could be done *ex post facto* at the impending convocation. Finally, on March 5, 1604, a proclamation described officially the steps that had been taken, and ordered the adoption of the new book.

The other tasks were more difficult of accomplishment. The fresh translation of the Bible, which had been agreed upon by all as desirable, was speedily put in hand; but the work was delayed, and not finally accom-^{The English Bible}plished for seven years yet. Of the two rival English translations, which hitherto had held the field, the Great Bishops' Bible of 1568 was the official book; but it was much disliked by the Puritans, and in general the handy Genevan version of 1560 was the popular book. Since the appearance of the later of these two a good deal had happened: two important Latin translations had been made abroad, besides valuable versions in French, Italian, and Spanish. Moreover, the English Roman Catholics had put forth their own version of the New Testament—a reproduction of the Latin Vulgate text in an English dress—at Reims in 1582, while they had ever since that time been busy on their version of the Old Testament, which, after long delays, made its appearance a year only before the new English version in 1610. The Rhemish New Testament had caused much controversy, due not so much to the text as to the controversial notes with which, like the Genevan version, it had adorned its margins. Fulke, who had replied to the attacks on the English version which Gregory Martin issued concurrently with the Rhemish Testament, went on to attack the rival version; he printed the text of the two in parallel columns with a running commentary

of his own ; and thus the rival version became known far more widely than would otherwise have been the case.

All these earlier labours were taken into account in the revision. Six companies, two in each of the universities and two in London, numbering about fifty members in all, devoted their time to the work. The Bishops' and the new version.

Bible was taken as the basis, but both the Genevan and the Rhemish powerfully affected the new version, the former supplying apt English phraseology and the latter supplying Latin terms in an English dress, which were strange when first adopted, but have since become so familiar as to seem indispensable. As befitted a book of such a catholic origin, no place was found in its margin for controversial notes. When the revision was completed in the three centres the final work was entrusted to a body representative of all six companies ; and the new Bible appeared from Barker's press in London in 1611. As a literary production it was beyond all praise, and though modern scholarship points to faults of translation and interpretation, its general faithfulness and accuracy has stood the test of nearly three centuries. Though it has acquired the title of "The Authorised Version," there is no evidence of any formal authorisation : it claimed on its title-page to be "Appointed to be read in Churches," and to have come into existence "by his Majesty's special command." The king had indeed himself taken all the initiative, since the proposal was made at Hampton Court, but there is no evidence of any official appointment. On its appearance the issue of the Bishops' Bible was speedily brought to an end : but the Genevan version flourished and competed with the new translation for a number of years to come ; and the victory of the version of 1611 was due not to any official authorisation, but rather to its intrinsic merits.

So far the demands of the moderate Puritans had attained a good deal ; but beyond this point their appeal was ineffectual : the obnoxious ceremonies were to continue, and they had failed to get such purgation of the prayer-book as would make it in their eyes a godly book. In their demand for amendments in church order they were more unsuccessful still. The jurisdiction of the bishops was to be somewhat limited by association with Other results not forthcoming.

their clergy in ordination, suspension, degradation, etc.; steps had already been taken of late in that direction, and the bishops now associated others with them in official acts such as excommunication; but no more was done, and things went on as before. The bishops indeed carried out the greater part of what was entrusted solely to them, but a body of commissioners, consisting of four bishops and five laymen, was less successful in accomplishing the matters entrusted to it. The misuse of the penalty of excommunication, by which it was hurled as a punishment at the head of one guilty of any small act of contempt of an ecclesiastical court, had long caused scandal. A bill to remedy this scandal had been among those quashed by the queen in parliament twenty years before, and ever since the grievance had been growing. Even now, however, the practice was not abolished in favour of a punishment by writ out of Chancery, as was proposed, or of some other civil punishment; for the profanation of the Church's most solemn censure still went on until 1813. The restriction of the action of the high commission to greater persons and greater causes was conceded, but not carried out without much difficulty; for soon a fierce contest was raging round the jurisdiction and procedure of that court, which raised much larger issues.

Lastly, in the matter of the supply and competence of the clergy, the improvement which now begins to become conspicuous was due not to any specific result of the conference, but to deeper causes. The king was never able to redeem his promise of restoring im-
The state of
the clergy
appropriate tithe for the support of the clergy: colleges and private owners were not sorry that no lead should be set them in the matter. But a new spirit of piety was rising which made the laity more willing to give and the clergy to serve.

There had been a tremendous revolution in the status of the parochial clergy since the dissolution of the monasteries. At that moment, if the county of Essex with its 400 benefices may be taken as a fair sample, the patronage of nearly half the benefices was in the hands of the monastic and religious institutions:
affected by
the dissolution
of the
monasteries,
1536,
the remaining advowsons were in the hands of lay patrons or else of official patrons, such as the bishop or the Crown, in

the proportion of three to one. The effect of the dissolution was to give the Crown four times as many advowsons as it had before, the bishop half as many again, and the lay patrons double as many; the small balance that remained over went to the chapters and colleges. This change was the more serious because the new lay patrons were not, as a rule, the old landlords and traditional owners of the manors, but the families that served Henry VIII. more faithfully than virtuously, such as the Riches, the Audleys, and the Darcys, who secured their dozen advowsons apiece in the rush to appropriate the spoil of the monasteries.

The religious orders had, as a rule, not only held the advowson, but in nearly three cases out of four they had made the benefice a vicarage, and appropriated the main part of the tithe; the same process had also gone on in some one's interest in other parishes where the advowson was not in monastic hands; therefore it may be reckoned that half the parishes were served by vicars who merely received a small stipend, and had been deprived of the major part of their endowments. Now, at the dissolution, this larger half had gone into lay hands; the amount which reverted to the parishes had been practically *nil*; a large slice had found its way to colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, for to endow with impropriate tithe was the cheapest form of benefaction for the Crown or the private individual. Elizabeth had handed over another slice to the bishops, but only on receiving its equivalent in manors and estates. Few people were really gainers, while the parishes were everywhere losers. In two further ways also their position was worsened: the corporations that took the rectorial tithes had not, as a rule, been very generous to the benefices which they thus mulcted, though in most cases they had been careful to see that their vicars were properly paid, and even now and then had restored to them the tithe and re-established them as rectors; but the new owners were far less considerate, and were more ready to diminish than increase the income of the vicars. Again, the patronage of the monks and others had formerly been honestly exercised, but the new race of patrons made no shame even of open simony.

Legislation in 1559 had stopped the alienation of the pro-

perty of the sees to any subject, but Elizabeth reserved to herself the power to receive such spoil. She had, moreover, grown increasingly content, so long as she had a few good and capable prelates to serve her, to give the rest of the ecclesiastical places to men of no worth except as sponges, whom she could first squeeze herself and then leave to suck up what they could in the positions where she placed them. Thus, in 1598, when the see of Salisbury was vacant, it was well known that it was only to be had by making a further surrender of the manor of Sherborne to that glutton for Church property, Sir W. Raleigh, who already had got possession at the last vacancy in 1591. It was thought that Bennet, Dean of Windsor, would do it, for he had beggared the Hospital of St. Cross at Winchester, of which he was master, in obtaining the deanery; but he refused, and a more compliant prelate was found in Cotton, a pluralist of the diocese of Winchester. Bennet had no further chance till 1603, when he became Bishop of Hereford, in spite of local protests against such a notorious spoiler. A year or two earlier all the talk had been of Winchester: Bishop Day had, in spite of many struggles, been forced to pay £1000 to Sir Francis Carew before he received possession, and when he died, after only eight months' possession of the see, Bilson, his successor, had to grant an annuity of £400 to the queen, besides further surrenders to Sir Francis and other royal servants.

With such an example before them it is not surprising that the nobility and gentry followed suit at a respectful distance in their own sphere. Thus both dioceses and parishes had been simoniacally robbed, partly by direct alienations and partly by fraudulent leases; and both the clergy and the benefices steadily deteriorated.

The signs that were now appearing of a better state of things were very welcome and much overdue; and though the king was a spendthrift in strong contrast to the economical Elizabeth, and many of his shifts to raise money were indefensible, the Church did not suffer. A statute of his first parliament, introduced by Bancroft, made illegal the alienation of the lands of bishops to the Crown. A new standard began to form both among

The pillage
of bishoprics
under
Elizabeth

was repro-
duced in the
parishes.

Signs of
recovery.

clergy and patrons, and the resources began to recover as the old and fraudulent leases began to fall in and the spirit of benefaction superseded the spirit of spoliation.

Simultaneously the competency of the clergy improved. The results of a steady diminution of "dumb dogs" have already been noted. No less marked was the improvement in social status. In the early part of Elizabeth's reign the clergy were both unlearned and ill-bred; later, though there was still great reluctance on the part of the gentry to send their sons into the ministry, the standards of birth and breeding went up just as did the standard of learning. The married clergy suffered from the dubious position of their wives, for clerical marriage was not yet authorised by statute: it was probably not Hooker alone who suffered from having a wife who was in education and refinement unworthy of him. But the early Elizabethan prejudices were passing away: the clergy, especially those of the puritan sort, were beginning to stand better with the gentry, while those of the opposite party were in favour with the humbler ranks and with the poor.

While the results of the Conference were being worked out, the chief link with the old *régime* was snapped by the death of Whitgift on February 29, 1604. He had been at the conference, but had left the greater part of his share in it to be carried out by his former chaplain, Bishop Bancroft. He was taken ill after attending a meeting held at Fulham in preparation for the coming parliament; and through insisting on going the following Sunday to his duty at the royal chapel of Whitehall, he became much worse. When the king visited him two days later, the dying archbishop tried to speak to him in Latin, but could not make himself understood; and finally he contented himself with saying repeatedly and earnestly, *Pro ecclesia Dei*, "for the Church of God." On the following day he died.

His last words were a fitting summary of his life, which was consumed in increasing labours in behalf of the Church.

These earned him much obloquy; and as during his lifetime he was consistently misrepresented by his enemies, so he has been persistently misjudged by posterity. None could deny his loftiness and consistency of aim, nor the honesty and incorruptibility which stood out

Death of
Whitgift.

His lofty
character and
aims.

conspicuous in a sordid and self-seeking age. His advent to the bishopric of Worcester had been distinguished not by any alienation, but by his recovery for the see of two manors which had been fraudulently leased to a courtier, and, further, by his compensating the lessee out of his own pocket. Similarly, at his promotion to Canterbury he recovered for the see another estate from the clutches of a courtier; and though he opposed the surrender of impropriate tithe by the colleges to which it had passed, he was ready himself to return much of what had come to him by increasing the stipends of the clergy. Such behaviour was notorious, and his generosity in money matters incontestable; but his evil fame was due to other causes.

One section has hated him for his treatment of puritans and sectaries, another for his conduct with regard to the Lambeth Articles; and in neither respect has he been justly treated. No doubt he was strict in his discipline, and this was particularly galling to those who did not wish themselves to feel the weight of the Church's discipline, but desired to exert another

The causes
of his
unpopularity
mistaken
ideas of his
severity

form of discipline over others; this strictness, however, was neither harsh nor unyielding. At the beginning of his primacy, in the midst of the outburst of misrepresentation which was evoked by his taking up the reins and whip, which had fallen from Grindal's impotent hands, he patiently listened for three days to the bucolic remonstrances of the Kentish squires; and at the moment when Burghley supposed him to be establishing an inquisition, he was restricting his demand for subscription, so as to give a respite and breathing space to men who were aghast at the very idea of being brought back to obedience from the wayward paths of their own sweet will. In short, he knew how to temper official rigidity with personal consideration and kindliness. Cartwright was not by any means the only puritan in trouble who profited by his mercifulness, nor Barrow the only prisoner whose lot was relieved by his interposition; indeed, he continually mitigated the rough justice of the Lords of the Council or the judges of assize. It suited presbyterian martyrs to lay the burden of blame and abuse on the bishops rather than on the officers of the Crown, but they had to sacrifice truth and justice in doing so, and they did

it only too successfully. The result has been that in the eyes of many Whitgift represents the extreme of prelatical intolerance.

If by others Whitgift is made to stand for the extreme of Calvinism, it is again a misrepresentation; the Lambeth Articles, though they now seem to be an extreme statement, ^{and} were, in fact, a compromise; Whitgift insisted on Calvinism. modifying the extreme language of the Cambridge theologians who had originally drawn up the propositions, before he put them forth; and when he sent them to Cambridge, it was only as a private *cirenicon* to meet a particular case. The notoriety which they obtained was due not to Whitgift, but to his puritan opponents, who wished to fasten them upon the Church.

The best testimony to Whitgift's reign is the moderation of the puritan demands embodied in the Millenary petition: it was no small triumph to have reduced disaffection to such comparatively small proportions. If the rule of Whitgift and Elizabeth could have continued, the history of England and English religion might have been more peaceable. But already the conduct of James and Bancroft at the conference had put matters in a new light, and raised fears instead of hopes for the future. Bancroft lived to learn a lesson of toleration and self-restraint; but the king unfortunately was incapable of any such change, and remained blind and unsympathetic.

AUTHORITIES.—For the whole reign see Gardiner, *History*, which is invaluable. The *State Papers* are far less full of ecclesiastical interest than in Elizabeth's reign; but the Calendar is fuller. The Privy Council Acts are not yet published.

The recusant *Supplications* are in print in several forms in the controversial literature of the day; see Tierney's *Dodd*, which continues to be useful, and *S.P. Dom.* i. 56, ii. 27. The Durham recusancy return is *S.P. Dom.* iii. 42. Others are in Harl. MSS. 594, 595. For York see Peacock, *List of Yorkshire Recusants*; and for a general summary, Harl. MS. 280. The same returns give the numbers of preachers and pluralists in the several dioceses. Cp. Haweis, *Sketches of the Reformation. Docum. Annals* gives the proclamation of February 1604, and other documents. The Millenary petition is in Fuller; also in Gee and Hardy. Cp. Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, for documents of the reign. Cardwell, *Conferences*, deals with the prayer-book and *Synodalia* as before with convocation. The Memorial of Abuses is *S.P. Dom.* i. 68. For the Herts petition see Winwood, *Memorials*, i. 36. The Oxford reply gives particulars as to the puritan petitions.

The king's dealings with the universities are in *S.P. Dom.* ii., and with the archbishop in iii. iv. For the English Bible see Westcott, *Hist. of Engl. Bible*; Carleton, *Reims and the Engl. Bible*. For the Commission to carry out the plans settled at Hampton Court see *S.P. Dom.* vi.

For the Church patronage of the diocese of London see Newcourt, *Repertorium*. For the status of the clergy see Haweis, *u.s.* For the Elizabethan episcopate see White, *Lives of Elis. Bishops*.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RULE OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT

TBancroft
succeeds
(1544-1610).HERE was little doubt as to Whitgift's successor at Canterbury. Within three weeks after his death convocation and parliament met, on March 19, 1604, and Bancroft, as Bishop of London, was called to preside over the synod. Thus, though he was not elected till November 17, nor confirmed till December 10, he stepped at once into the vacant place; and there he remained. He was recognised as the natural successor of his late master, whom he greatly resembled in character; the conciliatory qualities and large-heartedness, that mitigated the "choler," which was Whitgift's chief fault, were reproduced in the man of whom it was said that "he would chide stoutly but censure mildly." Whitgift's antecedents had been those of a peacemaker, though he had made the enemies that generally beset the upright peacemaker. Bancroft's had been those of a prosecutor, who had made his fame by tracking out the wanderings of Martin's elusive press, and by exposing the secrets of presbyterian conspiracy against existing church order; but in time he overcame the prejudice raised by his conduct at Hampton Court and by his antecedents generally, and he learnt to temper his strenuous zeal for the Church with a growing command of his temper, and consideration for his opponents.

Many expectations were centred on the coming parliament and convocation. The Puritans, resenting their treatment at Hampton Court, turned back again to parliament to seek succour there, and to renew the attempt after a parliamentary control of the Church, which had

A new
recusant
petition.

so signally failed in the last reign. The Recusants too were disappointed, but had not given up hope; in view of parliament they drew up a new *Supplication* to the king, on the lines of Colleton's *Petition Apologetical*, which had been presented to James at his first entry to the kingdom, but in fuller detail. Disregarding the answers to the pamphlet which had been made by Powell and Muriel, and disdaining mere controversy, they asked again not for open toleration, but for a reversal of the penal laws, and for license both for priest and layman to worship in private houses; they gave also, side by side with a protestation of their civil loyalty, a long description in thirty-eight heads of their religious tenets. A reply came forth in which it is stated that this petition never came to the king, but was only dispersed in corners. The writer also calls it contemptuously a "simple piece of work, patched out of Bristowe's *Motives* and Stapleton's invectives"; but in truth it was a dignified and pathetic utterance wrung out of loyal misery and conscientious suffering. It was a critical moment in the history of the Recusants. Foreign pressure was being brought to bear on James to make him carry out effectively the relaxations of which he approved; but puritan influence was pressing in the opposite direction. James was swaying between the two, and it was of vital importance to be able to represent the Recusants as being numerous, reasonable, loyal, and likely to form a securer support to the throne than the puritan party.

To convocation some clergy came with a proposal for a new reform of the prayer-book in their pockets, which proved abortive; while the bishops came with the draft of a code of canons. To parliament came members prepared to move against the decisions of Hampton Court. The proceedings evidently would not lack that crucial character which the dying archbishop had anticipated and dreaded. Indeed, all the parties concerned were in some degree at variance. The Commons were impelled by puritan sympathies, which were not shared by the Lords; the king was not in touch with parliament, and at the very beginning the signs were evident of that estrangement which grew more and more sinister throughout the reign. Parliament was jealous of convocation, and pre-

The prospects
of parliament
and convoca-
tion, March
19 to July 7,
1604.

pared to renew the rivalry which only Elizabeth's strong hand had controlled ; while the bishops and clergy were becoming more set upon emphasizing the divine character of the Church, and the Church itself more intent upon strengthening its position against parliamentary aggression. Most unfortunately it was led to attempt to secure its end by a dangerous alliance with an exaggerated form of that Divine Right of kings which served as a temporary bridge in political theory between Feudalism—the right that rests upon power over the people—and Constitutionalism—the right that rests upon their assent.

The king opened parliament on March 21, 1604, with a speech which, among other things, discovered the secrets of his

heart in point of religion. He spoke of the quarrel-
someness of the "Puritans and Novelists" as a bar
to their peaceable inclusion in any well-governed
commonwealth, and then went on to speak at length and in
favourable terms of the "falsely called Catholics." Disclaiming
all wish to persecute, and expressing some disapproval of the
harsh administration of the penal laws, he contemplated some
mitigation at any rate in favour of the loyal laity ; but he
said that the political claims of the papacy made it impossible
to extend toleration to the recusant clergy. He expressed an
earnest wish for a unity to be won by the laying aside of
wilfulness on both hands, by the reform of corruptions and
the renunciation of novelties. He claimed for himself the
true catholic and apostolic faith, grounded on the Scriptures
and the express Word of God, but duly revering antiquity in
the points of ecclesiastical policy, by which he trusted to be
kept from being either a heretic in faith or a schismatic in
matters of policy. Unfortunately the king's benevolent in-
tentions were unstable ; the protestantism of the country took
alarm, complained that the proclamation against the priests
was not acted upon, attacked furiously the recusant petitions,
and looked with open-eyed horror on the patent increase in
numbers and daring of the proscribed papists. James cowered
at this, changed his mind, and on May 17 complained to
parliament that measures were needed to curb this movement.
He watched it furbish up the old penal statutes and add one
new one, to which, in spite of much contrary pressure and an

The king's
action in
parliament.

expostulation from the secular priests, he gave his assent. Then with the shiftiness characteristic of a Stewart, he reverted to his former mind, said that the act should not be put in force, and remitted the fines for recusancy.

Parliament and convocation were soon at issue. The Commons began their work with an attempt to call in question the new edition of the prayer-book, and with some ecclesiastical complaints as to the courts and the suspended ministers. The first of these questions, after occupying the time of a committee for some days, was given up; but the other two were soon to grow to larger proportions. For the moment the House was equable, and ready to deal sternly with an ill-advised petitioner named Bridger, who set before the House an account of his sufferings; these he laid at the door of the ecclesiastical commission and the bishops, who, by enforcing subscription to the hated ceremonies, had qualified for the highest distinction in the puritan vocabulary, viz. to be called Anti-Christ.

Convocation having received the king's license, settled down to codify its canons; and, hearing the distant rumble of complaint, appointed on April 13 a committee of bishops to confer with the Speaker and Commons in order to listen to the grievances of the laity against the clergy; and, moreover, to retaliate with the rehearsal of the grievances of the clergy against the laity. The equableness of the Commons did not last long. Three days later Sir Francis Hastings began a fresh series of troubles by moving for a committee to deal with ecclesiastical reformation. Thereupon two messages came from the king. The first, on April 16, called upon the Commons to confer with the convocations before they intermeddled with these things; the second, which came on the day following, and after evidence that the House was piqued, stated in a more conciliatory form that convocation needed assistance from the House, and with its help would make inquiries and proceed to reform. The conference thus recommended by the king and convocation, the Commons characteristically declined; but they agreed to treat with the bishops as members of the House of Lords. On May 5 they submitted six ecclesiastical proposals,—as to subscription, and as to the

its ecclesiastical doings

and clash with convocation are closed by the king's speech;

quality, number, and support of the clergy, together with a protest against the exaction of any subscription save that to the Articles, and against the deprivation of ministers who merely refused the surplice and crossing. Committees of each House thereupon met, and the king delivered his views on the six points under discussion, advising that a sub-committee should draw up a programme of reform for the parliament and Crown. It was agreed to proceed with bills against recusants and against pluralities, and in favour of a learned ministry. The question of the Articles was to be deferred till next parliament.

On May 24 Hastings moved for a second conference, and on June 4, when it took place, the Bishop of London replied to the document from the Commons by ^{but they are renewed again,} reading an instrument from the Lower House of convocation, which complained of the interference of the Commons, and blamed the bishops for conferring with them instead of dealing with abuses in the convocation according to the royal directions in the letters of business. Thus had the pique spread from parliament to convocation. When Hastings reported this result to the Commons, seventeen members leapt up with rival proposals and motions, to protest against the "pamphlet" of convocation, to examine precedents, and to cry mercy for the threatened ministers. Eventually it was decided to examine precedents, and to petition the Crown for a dispensation for nonconformists.

The Commons had already through their committee initiated a series of bills relating to a learned ministry, pluralities, and ecclesiastical courts; and they now ^{and continue to the end of the session.} drew up a petition to the king in favour of the ministers who, they say, on conscientious grounds have scruples against the cross, the ring, and the subscription to other points than those prescribed by the laws of the realm—meaning by this, of course, only the parliamentary law. Meanwhile the sensation caused by the bomb from the Lower House of convocation went on. The Commons adverted to the religious question in the noble apology which they addressed to the king on June 20 by way of remonstrance about the many points on which they were at issue

with him, explaining that they had not disputed about matters of faith and doctrine; but only out of loyal zeal for the Church had sought peace, uniformity, and the amelioration of the ministry. A further conference was held a week before the end of the session, at which the Bishop of London acted as mediator, and smoothed the antagonism of the two Lower Houses. The quarrel with the Crown was not so easily appeased, and the Commons went sadly home on July 7, dismissed with a scolding from the king.

The last month of the session had witnessed countless attempts at ecclesiastical legislation; a few of the bills, notably some of those promoted by the committee, had passed the Lower House; but they went no further ^{Other quarrels in Parliament.} than one reading in the Lords. The only points that disturbed the equanimity of the Upper House were more personal. An attack was made in the Commons upon Bancroft for the help that he had given to the secular priests in their contest with the Jesuits. He had certainly laid himself open to attacks by facilitating their journeys and their secret printing; but Earbury and Jones, who led the attack, found themselves imprisoned, not applauded, and Bancroft's action approved as diplomatic. Lord Montagu was less fortunate; his advocacy of the recusant cause during the debate on the new penal law cost him four days' imprisonment in the Fleet, from which he was only released on making an humble submission. A like submission was also demanded and obtained of the Bishop of Bristol for his work on the subject of the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland. So the first session of this parliament passed.

The code of canons which had been framed by convocation at this session now received the royal authorisation; but it was not till two years later that the convocation of the northern province met to deal with ^{The Canons of 1604,} it, and that, having been passed there, it was properly promulgated in both provinces. This code still remains in force, although subsequent synodical legislation has altered it in various details, and parts of it have become obsolete or even lapsed through desuetude. It was based to a large extent on previous enactment; large sections of the various sets of canons of the last reign were incorporated

into it, while other parts were drawn from secondary documents of recent years—Injunctions, Interpretations, Advertisements, etc. No small proportion of its provisions went back to the old canon law, to medieval English constitutions, or the more general legislation of the Western Church. But there was much also that was new, and bore the marks of its time.

The first division deals with the Church of England in general, and comprises a set of twelve anathemas against opponents of its faith and polity, redolent of the controversies of the moment, but of a general and fundamental character. The second division comprises eighteen canons bearing on divine service and the administration of the sacraments; the greater part of these are old, but the last—the 30th Canon, in defence of the crossing at baptism—is of quite a different style from the rest, and is, no doubt, the outcome of a heated discussion on this burning topic held in convocation on May 23. Forty-six canons follow, dealing with the ministry, and three with schoolmasters, then twelve dealing with church ornaments and officers; six divisions, containing altogether forty-seven canons, concern the working of the ecclesiastical courts; and the code, containing 141 canons all told, closes with a set of three anathemas relating to the authority of convocation. The sting in the head was newly provided for puritans and sectaries; that in the tail for Erastians and politicians; but it remained to be seen how far either would prove effective. The canons further tightened the screw of discipline in several important ways, *e.g.* by demanding subscription to the three points already in controversy, by insisting on kneeling at communion and the wearing of cope and surplice: all these demands had already been put forward and become bones of contention; but hitherto they had had no formal canonical sanction. Experience would decide whether or no they could hereafter be more successfully enforced than hitherto.

The decision was not long delayed; a proclamation was issued on July 16, to explain that the Hampton Court conference had shown that no material alterations in church polity were needed; and that, though since then parliament had insisted on reopening

and their
scope.

The rebellion
of the
Puritans

disputes, they had only led to the same conclusion. Consequently "troublesome spirits" were to be ignored, and all the clergy were to unite in conformity by the end of November, or else be ejected.

The complacent optimism of the king can hardly have been really so blind as would appear from this document. There was quite another view of the Conference, ^{develops,} which had been spreading itself through the country, not at all to the liking of king or bishops; and when the parliamentary attempt to open a more fair consideration of the puritan case failed in its object, the disaffection spread and became organised. In all the chief puritan centres opposition began to gather round the threefold subscription to the supremacy, the prayer-book, and the Articles. The bishops, backed by the new canons, had begun to demand this even before the expiration of the time of grace appointed in the king's proclamation.

The battle began in the diocese of Lincoln, and the opposition was headed not by the most extravagant, but by one of the most tolerant of puritans. John Burgess was no fanatic, but a moderate man, who in time ^{led by John Burgess,} past had maintained the lawfulness of the prayer-book ceremonies: he had even subscribed four times, though he considered the use of them so inexpedient that he could not himself conform. As a leader of the moderate party he had been called upon to preach before the king on June 19, 1604; but a slighting allusion to the ceremonies offended the king, and he was sent to the Tower. After a fortnight's imprisonment he was gently dealt with by the Bishop of London and the Dean of the Chapel-Royal; thereupon he sent to the king a statement of his views, and of the sense in which he had hitherto subscribed, with a renewed subscription in the same sense, *i.e.* as approving the prayer-book, not according to its details, but according to the generally expressed intention of the Church. On this he was discharged from the Tower; but within a week the proclamation of July 16, calling for a fresh subscription according to the canons, appeared, and Burgess felt that circumstances were now so much altered that he could not subscribe again. The intention of the Church was now by the Conference, the canons, and the

new part of the Catechism declared to be other than he had taken it to be; and Burgess declared in the apology that he presented to the king and to the bishop, that, though he did not withdraw his former subscriptions, he could not under these new conditions subscribe again.

This change of attitude in one who had hitherto, at any rate in theory, been a defender of the obnoxious book and ceremonies, brought together a body of resisters; and thirty clergy followed Burgess to the Bishop of Lincoln's palace on October 3, to support his refusal and his apology for it. They pushed on from the episcopal palace to the presence-chamber of the king, where they presented their apology on December 1, 1604. The king told them to set down their complaints against the canons in writing, and to state what terms would satisfy them. They did so, and, to secure permanence for their plea and a wider recognition, they published in the next year an *Abridgment* of this apology, giving at great length two of their exceptions against the prayer-book, viz. those against the lectionary and the ceremonies, with a summary of their objections to the rest in tabular form thus: It is like the mass-book, it is too lengthy, and curtails sermons; it contains nineteen popish errors; it encourages profanation of the sacraments; it contains three points that are doubtful, seven that are untrue, seven that are disorderly, five that are ridiculous, besides many evident contradictions. The homilies and the ordinal fared no better. So the paper war began; but mercifully the portentous programme thus sketched was never worked out in the fullness promised.

Meanwhile in other districts besides the Leicestershire part of the diocese of Lincoln the interval of grace had been keenly utilised. The proceedings of the ministers in the diocese of Exeter show the movement that was going on there, and it was no doubt paralleled in other places, particularly the Midlands and the diocese of London. They chose as their agent a minister, an ex-basket-maker, named Melancthon Jewel, of Exeter, who ten years or more previously had been convicted of dispersing seditious books, and therefore deprived. Since then he had gone about as a vagrant minister; in the preceding July he had been caught

Progress of
the campaign
in Lincoln
diocese,

and in Exeter
diocese.

and silenced; but he had continued to preach nevertheless. A more engrossing occupation was found for him in keeping touch with the puritan movements in other districts, and in consulting lawyers in London as to the course to be taken. In the end of November 1604 he had been in London in the thick of agitation. A puritan deputation went before the Council, but was not favourably received, and Hildersham, one of the Leicester ministers, its leader, was sent to prison. This was followed by a petition to the king from 200 gentlemen of Essex, who said, more boastfully than threateningly, that there were 4000 ready to come up and present it.

Close upon this came the interview of the king with Burgess and his supporters from the diocese of Lincoln; and a week later, on December 7, Lancashire sent a petition to the king from a dozen justices in favour of their ministers, who had had the special respite granted them at Hampton Court, but were now on the verge of deprivation. Bancroft was then leaving his diocese for Canterbury; on the day of the Lancashire petition he summoned his nonconforming clergy, but treated them very gently, neither depriving nor suspending any. He explained that there need be no precipitate action taken with them, but left them to his successor to deal with. When they resented subscription, he urged them at any rate to conform; and when they rebelled at that, he pleaded that in any case they would use surplice and cross, or one of them, or that, at least, they would admit that such might be lawfully used. This was all very pacific; but when twenty-two London ministers presented a schedule of complaints against the corruptions in the prayer-book, their spokesman, Smith of St. Nicholas Acon, was deprived and sent to the Fleet; for aggressiveness was evidently to the archbishop's mind a very different thing from quiet scrupulosity.

From the midst of this atmosphere Jewel returned home, bringing with him the legal advice which was to shape the conduct of the war with the Bishop of Exeter. The lawyers damped a little the ardour of their clients, but they selected some points of resistance, saying that certain of the canons were contrary to law, custom, and usage, and therefore void; that their action should be stopped

Lancashire
and London
contribute
to it,

and the
lawyers
chime in.

by a writ of prohibition from a temporal court, and that meanwhile a deprived minister should retain possession. Especially, they urged petitions for a judicial decision as to the legality of the 36th Canon, which demanded the triple subscription. This expedient was evidently being taken up elsewhere, for Essex, Sussex, Suffolk, and London sent petitions to that end, as well as Devon and Cornwall. Unfortunately Jewel himself, returning laden with his burden, fell into the hands of the enemy, and the bishop sent him to the common gaol to keep company with a popish recusant lately apprehended. Nevertheless his agitation went on and still grew.

Meanwhile the delay in Bancroft's appointment came to an end. Outside his late diocese of London the enforcement of subscription had not waited for this; in some dioceses the bishops had taken their own action, in others a local ecclesiastical commission had taken up the task. At Cambridge the chancellor, Sir Robert Cecil, already become Lord Cranborne, and soon to be made Earl of Salisbury, was moving to secure uniformity and subscription. On December 10, the day of Bancroft's confirmation, the Council wrote to the two archbishops reminding them that the space for delay and persuasion had elapsed, and that persistent nonconformists were thenceforward liable to deprivation and deposition: they were, therefore, to be ejected, and none but trustworthy men put in their places. A special intimation was sent to the Bishop of Lincoln for his guidance in dealing with his refusers. At the same time the king had private instructions prepared for the archbishop—that to those who would not subscribe or conform, and were thereupon to be sentenced, an opportunity should be given for making some offer to the king and Council as to how far they would go in the matter of conformity: meanwhile the benefices which were vacated were to be kept empty for a while. These instructions for the primate were not published; it is not even clear that they were ever sent.

When the letters of the Council went out, Archbishop Hutton in the northern province felt that there was more need of a renewal of the commission to repress the growth of recusancy than of special dealing with nonconformity; but

The Council
urges the
repression
of non-
conformity.

Bancroft in the south sent out at once a series of directions as to the proceedings to be taken with the recalcitrant clergy. Those who would conform ^{Bancroft's directions, Dec. 22, 1604,} but not subscribe were to be given further time: those who refused both conformity and subscription were to be put out at once if they were only licensed clergy, and if they were beneficed they were to be proceeded against under the Act of Uniformity as refusing or depraving the prayer-book, and so deprived; also the sting of the anathema was to be used against those who incurred it. Bancroft ended with an apology for this severe dealing; but in fact it was less severe than might have been expected: indeed, both of the archbishops were loath to proceed to extremities, and were being urged on by the king and the Council.

After this, suspension and deprivation became the order of the day in the parts where hitherto action had been deferred. Angry cries were heard from many dioceses, and the politicians, who had stirred up all the hubbub, ^{and the resulting protests} characteristically decided that it must be left to the bishops to manage. The Warwickshire ministers complained of twenty-seven suspended in their county; those in Northamptonshire were said to be even in worse case. Those of Devon and Cornwall presented their protests to their bishop, and when he proceeded to deprive a refuser of subscription, they at once applied to the King's Bench for a prohibition. After consultation of all the judges it was decided that such deprivation was legal and valid; so they had no further resource but to put forth their protests in a book, which, like the document from Lincoln, became the starting-point of further controversy.

More remarkable from the standpoint of to-day, though less effective then, was the defiance set forth in the diocese of Worcester, perhaps by the remonstrants of Warwickshire. It took the form of *Certain Considerations* ^{of ministers} to prove that the bishop was not legally justified in depriving "for not subscription, for the not exact use of the order and forme of booke of common prayer." The argument was a development of that already started by Beale, viz. that the book then in use was not that described by the Uniformity Act, and the demand as to vestments then enforced was not

that of the ornaments' rubric, but one imposed by Parker's Advertisements, which, not being a taking of further order under the act, could not supersede the authority of the rubric. This argument apparently met with no reply; it was incontestable as a mere legal argument, though it did not honestly state the Puritans' point; and though urged continually in one form or another, it was really insincere in their mouths.

While these treatises, and others more personal and less representative, were pouring forth, the dealings with the clergy and gentry had been going on. A lay protest from forty-four gentry of Northamptonshire raised the king's anger further: it was not only boastful of the number of its supporters, but it added almost a threat that many would be discontented if it were disregarded: it sounded insolent to the king, and he decided to bear with this bombardment no longer. The author of the petition, Sir Francis Hastings, who had led the popular party in the last parliament, was reprimanded by the Council, and sent to his own home in Somerset to mind his own business. A few days later, on Ash Wednesday, in order to tune public opinion and to deter the opposition, the judges were called before the Council in the Star Chamber, and they there declared once again that the ecclesiastical commission could deprive for nonconformity; adding also that a petition to the king like that from Northamptonshire, which threatened him that a refusal would discontent many thousands of his subjects, came very near to treason and felony. A public declaration on the part of the king of his ecclesiastical policy followed upon this: papists and puritans were alike to be humoured no longer, but to be sent to the assizes and made to feel the weight of the law.

Happily the archbishop's distinction between subscription and conformity, and the "brotherly exhortations with mildness and discretion" exercised by such a bishop as Chaderton, with whom the Lincoln ministers had to deal, minimised the havoc which was at first threatened: provision was made that the deprived might have two or three months' respite in which to find a new abode; and ultimately the number of those ejected was inconsiderable. The Puritans spoke of "a third or fourth part of three

are quashed
by the judges,
Feb. 13, 1605,
and the king.

The number
of ejected
clergy

or four hundred painfull, discreet, learned, grave, and godly ministers within less than six monthes suspended, deprived, and deposed, some from their offices and some from their benefices." Burgess claimed 746 nonconformists in twenty-four counties; and the total ejections were estimated in the puritan literature of the time in a *crescendo* from 260 to over 300. But such estimates did not distinguish between those who threatened opposition and those who made it and persisted in it, nor between those who were suspended at the outset and those who were ultimately deprived.

As the struggle went on, and gentle terms were offered, many thought better of their attitude and accepted them. In Devon and Cornwall thirty-nine were at first reckoned "resolute"; but in a very short time ten ^{much} exaggerated. had subscribed, twelve conformed, only three had been deprived, three more suspended, and one imprisoned. Lord Cranborne, indeed, wisely forecast that the register of recalcitrant puritans would never be a long one if they were not flattered and encouraged for private ends by the gentry of the neighbourhood; and he truly maintained that their number, like that of the Papists, had been greatly exaggerated. It has been stated on Heylyn's authority that the official returns made by Bancroft showed the actual number of the deprived to be forty-nine, and this is far more credible than the heated estimates of the Puritans. In the diocese of London, which was a strong puritan centre, where Vaughan, Bancroft's successor, combined a conciliatory handling with a thorough unshrinking administration, the numbers only amounted to five or six, no more than were deprived in a time of comparative peace during the years 1608 and 1609, by his successor, Ravis. The diocese of Peterborough, which was by far the worst affected, showed fifteen deprivations. In the dioceses of Lincoln and Exeter, which were very troublesome, only eight and five deprivations are recorded respectively; in Norwich five, and in Canterbury one. These figures support Heylyn's statement; and even if, as is possible, the estimate did not include the unbeneficed ministers who were ousted, the total would still be inconsiderable.

It would be very wrong to judge of the force of puritanism in the country from the number of irreconcilable non-

conforming clergy. This party was now losing the almost complete monopoly of the seriously-minded which it had at first enjoyed; the reason was that seriousness was becoming more general, and to a large extent the prevalent growth of piety was due to influences which were far removed from puritanism. Consequently it was not at all uncommon for devout congregations to resent the nonconformity of their ministers. Both conservatism and the new influence of a better churchmanship told in that direction, and it is noticeable that the pertinacious nonconformists were nearly all senior men ordained twenty or thirty years before, in the era of Grindal. Puritanism, however, was by no means the same as nonconformity, and it retained a large body of the best piety of England, and especially of those men who either loved religious individualism, or were dominated in their conception of the external polity of the Church by an unintelligent devotion to the Bible and an unintelligent horror of Rome. Its hold was far greater on the richer laity than upon either the main body of Englishmen or the clergy: as a religious power its effect was proportionately less than it had been; but it was making up in political force what it was losing in spiritual influence.

Equally, therefore, would it be wrong to judge of the real value of either side in the combat by the value of the points which were prominently at issue. Small external matters, such as details of ceremonial, are continually the ostensible reasons of a quarrel, whose real causes lie much deeper. The puritan did not do his cause justice when he declined to subscribe to the prayer-book because of its mishandling the scripture text by wrong translation or by omission of the word *Selah* from the Psalms. The churchman was not really commending his case when he seemed to be stickling for details which he acknowledged to be in themselves unimportant; and the spectator would miss the whole point of this tournament unless he saw that the puritan was contending for the exclusive authority of the Bible against the churchman's contention for the co-ordinate authority of the Body of Christ, the Church. The ceremonies were a convenient battle-ground on which the rival contentions met, the puritan maintaining that no ceremonies might be

The puritan
party more
considerable,

and the issues
larger than
this would
suggest.

imposed which were not authorised by the Bible, the churchman insisting that such ceremonies might be imposed by church authority which were not contrariant to the Bible. This was the real point of issue, so far as ecclesiastical questions were concerned. But the struggle between puritanism and churchmanship was now beginning to become more a political than an ecclesiastical question: the bishops leaned on the commission, the commission on the king; and thus the Church entered on a false alliance with untenable royal claims to prerogative and absolute government, while the Puritans allied themselves with parliament and the strong movement that was conspicuous among the gentry towards individual liberty and constitutional government. The working out of these movements occupied the whole of James's reign and terminated abruptly the reign of his son. Thus the strength of its political aspirations won a triumph for puritanism at the Rebellion which the weakness of its ecclesiastical standpoint lost for it again at the Restoration.

AUTHORITIES.—The estimate of Whitgift is from Hacket, *Life of Williams*. The *Journals* describe the proceedings of parliament, but cp. *S.P. Dom.* vi. vii. viii. The expostulation of the secular priests of July 1604 is in *S.P. Dom.* viii. 125.

For Burgess see *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and *S.P. Dom.* viii. 85; and for the movement, *S.P. Dom.* x. (especially 61*, which is not in the *Calendar*) and xii. Also the printed tracts of the time, including, besides those mentioned in the text, the replies to the Lincoln ministers by Hutton, *Reasons for Refusal . . . with an Answer*; and Covell, *A Brief Answer unto certain Reasons; A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer* (1606 and 1610); *Certain Arguments to Persuade . . . the Parliament; A Short Dialogue; Certain Demands with their Grounds; A Myld and Just Defence*. For a general estimate as to the power of puritanism see *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1904.

CHAPTER XIX

THE POWDER PLOT

WHILE the Puritans were suffering from the consistency of James's policy, the Recusants were still suffering from his inconsistency. Their fortunes varied with the criticisms made on his policy by his subjects at home, and with the fluctuations in his negotiations abroad with Spain, Germany, or the Netherland States. Accordingly the fines were alternately remitted and enforced; persecution was alternately encouraged and discouraged; bishops and judges were goaded or restrained; priests were sent to prison or into banishment. When he ventured upon dealings with Rome, the effects were more disastrous still. It can hardly be a cause of wonder that, in these circumstances, some of the worst principled among the Recusants should have been driven to desperation and villainy.

In the beginning of Lent 1604, Catesby, John Wright, and Winter met at Lambeth to devise the Gunpowder Plot.

Catesby's
designs
hatched

Catesby had hitherto looked to Spain for help, but lately, finding his expectations in that quarter futile, he had brooded over a more secret and more drastic method, until he hatched his scheme and revealed it to his friends. Parliament was to be undermined and blown up with gunpowder. In May the design was solemnly undertaken under an oath of secrecy by five principals, comprising two new recruits, Thomas Percy and Guy Fawkes. A house was leased adjoining the House of Lords, but nothing was done before the prorogation of parliament, in July. They separated, to reassemble in the autumn. Thereupon further delays occurred,

and it was not till December that they set to work at their mine. To counterbalance the delay, however, came the prorogation of parliament from February 1605 to October; they therefore had leisure to complete their schemes and improve their basis of operations before they again dispersed for the summer.

Meanwhile the persecution was raging at full height; the same Ash Wednesday's meeting that sharpened the weapons against puritans (p. 320) directed them against recusants also. The judges, urged on by the king, ^{under great provocation,} were soon busily at work; at the assizes more than 6000 persons within thirty-three counties were convicted of recusancy, with the assistance of the bishops and their officials. On March 12, 1605, Bancroft had issued elaborate and discriminating directions, similar to those which he had drawn up earlier to deal with nonconformity; they only prescribed, in the first place, conference, and, failing that, excommunication; but since the Conference the civil procedure ensuing upon excommunication had been facilitated. The Chancery writ *De excommunicato capiendo* was now issued free, and care was taken that the sheriffs should not neglect it; consequently all forces converged to secure the wholesale condemnation of recusants. To a large extent the persons convicted were new recusants, who had not been brought up at the previous assizes. In one respect these assizes were milder than heretofore, since there was no shedding of blood. In 1604, Sugar, a priest, and Grissold, a layman, had been condemned at Warwick and executed in July, and Lawrence Baily, another layman, perished at Lancaster in August or September. These were exceptions, for elsewhere those condemned were reprieved. The gentler policy was pursued now until the later assize of the year, when the blood of three laymen flowed in the north. But there was a general increase in desperation and daring.

Northampton, the puritan centre, and "chief foundation of that humour," was now disturbed by night assemblies of gatherings of armed recusants. Wild speech of rebellion and massacre was heard in the north, ^{and amid much unrest.} where seventy of the principal gentry of Yorkshire, apart from those certified as recusants, were reported to be so seriously suspect as to be unfit for office. In the west,

where abortive attempts had been made to raise the country at Elizabeth's death, there was again undisguised talk of an appeal to civil war, since there was "no further hope for Catholics, being leapt out of the frying pan into the fire." Open resistance was given to the officials of the Bishop of Hereford in arresting the leaders, after open scandal had been caused by a recusant funeral and mass, which took place on a Sunday by daylight, with a large company present carrying wax candles before the corpse. It was in vain for the Jesuit General to urge Garnet, the provincial in England, in the pope's name to keep down disturbances; he succeeded in repressing four "tumults"; but he was met by a claim from the Recusants that they had a right to arm in self-defence in spite of the pope's exhortation to submission. Thus he had his hands more than full. Similarly, Blackwell the arch-priest, though he published this exhortation, as a definite order from the pope to enjoin quietness, was unable to get it obeyed. In vain also was the government warned that the Recusants were becoming desperate, and informed that the pope and the priests would co-operate in securing loyalty, if some toleration were granted. The policy of shiftiness and indecision went on, and no warning could bring King James or his advisers to any more consistent or more enlightened policy.

The conspirators came back to London ready for action in September; but after having completed their preparations they heard of the further prorogation to November 5. The interval was fatal; they were forced by need of money to reveal the plan to some men of wealth, and to ask their co-operation. One of these men, Francis Tresham, though he lent himself to the scheme, grew more and more dissatisfied; finally, on October 26, he sent a warning message to his brother-in-law, Lord Montague, ostensibly to prevent his presence at the opening of parliament when the explosion was to take place, but, really, as it seems, in order that the whole plot might be revealed in such a way as would give those engaged in it facilities for escape. The news was handed on at once to the government. Partly incredulous and partly cautious, it held its hand and took no step. The conspirators therefore determined to persevere; and, in spite of all, Fawkes took

Delay proves
fatal to the
plot, Nov.
1605.

up his guard as usual in the house on the eve of November 5. There he was discovered and taken; the rest were at a distance and fled; they tried to effect the rising in the Midlands which they had planned, but it proved abortive; the bettermost Recusants refused to co-operate. Their flight became more desperate, and vengeance seemed to pursue them, for they suffered themselves from an accident caused by an explosion of powder. On the 8th a stand was made against the officers of the law in Staffordshire; four, including Catesby and Percy, were shot, the rest were overpowered, and before long all the survivors were lodged in prison.

By that time the whole was known; Fawkes was being tortured in the Tower, and preparations were being made for a thanksgiving on the coming Sunday. A long investigation followed, and every effort was made to connect the Jesuits with the plot. Tresham died before Christmas, after first incriminating Garnet the superior, and, in a larger degree Tesimond, *alias* Greenway, one of his fellows, and then making a sorry attempt to deny what he had allowed. It was not till January 27 that the eight survivors were tried at Westminster Hall; but then justice moved speedily, and within a week they were condemned and executed.

A fortnight before, attempts had been made to lay hold of the Jesuits who had been in communication with the conspirators. Gerard, who had little or no suspicion of what was going on, and Greenway, who through confession was privy to the whole, made good their escape; but Garnet was tracked out and brought to London, together with a priest named Oldcorne, who eventually shared his fate, and their two servants. Owen, Garnet's man, when he foolishly denied all knowledge of his master, was strung up by his thumbs, and a confession was extracted from him; but dread of the repetition of the torture drove him to suicide. Garnet was spared torture; but, by the ruse of overhearing his conversations with Oldcorne, his secrets were discovered. He then confessed that he had had dealings with Catesby on the subject of his enterprise without knowing its details, and that subsequently Greenway's knowledge had been handed on to him under the seal of

A long
investigation
follows,

especially as
to the com-
plicity of the
Jesuits.

confession; he had been horrified on discovering its true character, and had made many remonstrances, especially since he was officially ordered from Rome by his own General to discourage any disturbance among his people.

His trial took place March 28, 1606, and he was charged with complicity in the plot on the ground of his dealings with Catesby, not on the ground of what he had heard in confession: his defence was that he had no knowledge of the plot except through the latter channel. The 113th Canon, in rehearsing the old

Garnet's position, trial, and conviction, March 28, 1606.

severe penalties for any breach of the seal of confession on the part of ministers of the English Church, had made a novel exception in the case of crimes the concealment of which would call the confessor's own life into question; but, even if such crimes existed, which seems doubtful, this was permissive, not compulsory; and, even if the canon was thought to be applicable to Garnet, this exception could not be held to be a positive direction to reveal what he was told. Apart from this canon, the law absolutely forbade disclosure, in spite of Coke's assertion to the contrary; the indictment therefore took the other ground, and on it he was convicted. The conviction was due to two subsidiary causes rather than to the central charge and the evidence about it: first, to a general demand that a victim should be found from among the priests, who were credited with the main guilt of every such crime; secondly, to a mistrust of everything that seemed to favour their innocence, because of the character for lying which Jesuits had already acquired, and which especially attached to Garnet from the discovery at this very juncture of a treatise on equivocation in which he had a share.

The extent to which the doctrine of equivocation was being utilised is exemplified by a contemporary instance. John Ward, *alias* Sicklemore, was arrested in Northumberland

The doctrine of equivocation.

on January 16, 1606. He denied on oath that he was a seminary or a priest, and on his denial he was confronted with one Hawkesworth, a priest who had conformed to the English Church, of whom he had denied all knowledge, though it was proved that Hawkesworth had served him at mass. He then explained his oath by saying that he was not a priest, *sc.* of Apollo; that he had never been over the seas,

sc. the Indian seas ; that he never knew Hawkesworth, that is *scientia scientifica* ; had never seen him, that is *in visione beatifica* ; and so on. Sicklemore was soon after among the banished, and so disappeared from view ; but such proceedings, which were not without their parallel among Garnet's own associates, could not fail to prejudice the public mind against recusant clergy, and affect Garnet's slender chances of escape.

To modern ears the account of his trial sounds like a perversion of justice ; but it must be judged by the standard of the times, for both the mechanism of procedure and our conceptions of justice are relative. To the men of the time it was Garnet's acquittal, if it could have been conceived at all, that would have seemed a miscarriage ; and when he stated, probably with entire truth, upon the scaffold, that his information obtained from Catesby was only of vague sort, and that he had no real knowledge except that obtained in confession, the statement must have seemed to those who heard it not an effective protest against his sentence, but an ample justification of it.

The justice
of the case.

His execution was delayed and further examinations took place, which raised some hope of a pardon ; but finally he suffered in St. Paul's Churchyard on May 3, 1506.

If the authorities relented at all during the delay, their mercy did not extend beyond securing for him a mitigation of the extremer barbarities of his sentence. Oldcorne had preceded him a month earlier, being executed at Worcester on April 7. There was less to incriminate him than Garnet, and yet he suffered worse things, not being spared torture as Garnet was. An ill-assorted pair shared his fate, viz. Ashley, whose crime was that he had been his faithful servant, and Littleton, who had been his faithless friend and, in hope of saving his own life, had betrayed him.

Garnet's
execution
follows that of
Oldcorne and
their com-
panions.

Meanwhile parliament had met quietly, but only for a few days : when it reassembled on January 21, it was clearly under the influence of the excitement of the hour ; and though it rejected proposals to mete out some specially barbarous punishment to the conspirators, it made, after much discussion and deliberation, two new penal acts against the popish recusants. By the first

Fresh penal
laws in parlia-
ment, Nov. 5,
1605, to May
27, 1606.

they were to be driven by heavy penalties not only to church but to communion. An attempt made in the Upper House to forgo compulsion to communion, and to leave that matter in ecclesiastical hands, dissatisfied the fierce puritanism of the Commons and had to be given up. Further fines were to be exacted, stricter presentments made, and a new oath of allegiance demanded of all suspected persons under pain of *præmunire*. By the second act, additional inducements were held out to informers, and many disabilities were laid upon recusants; they were banished from Court, kept from London and its environs unless they had their fixed occupation there, confined in one place of abode, excluded from the legal and medical professions, from posts in the army and navy, and, in short, from all "public office or charge in the commonwealth." The difficult problem of the recusant wives of conforming husbands was dealt with by forfeiture. Recusants were for the future to be under most of the civil disabilities of excommunication, even if they had not actually been excommunicated. These are but a selection from the cruelties which were heaped upon the heads of those who shared not the treason, but only the religious views, of the conspirators. A despairing appeal, like the appeal of Wigan Cross (see p. 291), was made by the Recusants to Bancroft; and, whether he was influenced by it or not, at all events his voice was uplifted against these severities. He is even said to have proposed toleration to the Recusants for four years; but a brother bishop replied that it was a pity to tolerate them seven days, and he voiced the general opinion of the legislators. Their cup was indeed now full: beyond three small additions made to these penal laws in 1612 and 1628 protestant ingenuity had no more that it could devise against its unfortunate victims.

It must not, however, be forgotten that the new oath, which was to be such a fruitful source of further controversy and trouble, was meant to be in some degree a mitigation. It was an attempt to distinguish the loyal from the disloyal recusant, though it did not of itself exempt the former from fines and disabilities. An oath of allegiance, however, was valueless in the mouth of a man who believed, or even was thought to believe, that the pope could at any moment dispose of the Crown otherwise, and dispense

The oath of
allegiance
imposed.

him from what he had sworn. It was therefore necessary that the oath should include a repudiation of the deposing and dispensing powers of the pope. The result was that the loyal recusant was once again shown to be in a dilemma: he had to choose between the conscience that taught him to be loyal to the throne and the conscience that taught him to champion the claims emanating from Rome. Though during the progress of parliament the measure had been brought to a soberer form, the terms of the oath were not only comprehensive but abusive: they were framed, it is said, by Bancroft with the help of the ex-Jesuit Perkins, on the lines of the protestation of allegiance drawn up by the Secular Priests in 1603. They did not, as was proposed, deny the pope's power to excommunicate; but besides denying the deposing power, they further "abjured as impious and heretical the damnable doctrine and position" that excommunicated princes might be deposed and murdered. The violence of the language made the oath a more difficult one for recusants to take; but in fact the principal objection to it was that it essentially limited a claim to authority which in the view of its best supporters was unlimited. It remained to be seen how it would be viewed by those to whom it was propounded.

The grievances of nonconformity were again to the front in parliament, and the tradition of abortive ecclesiastical legislation in their interest was maintained. On February 26 the silenced ministers of Lincolnshire petitioned ^{Puritan grievances in parliament,} for help, and a more general petition on behalf of the deprived appeared in print; it was followed shortly by *A Consideration* of it by Gabriel Powell in a hostile sense, and then by a rejoinder, *A Mild and Just Defence of "Certain Arguments,"* etc. Bills for reform in the ministry and in church government made their appearance and disappearance, conferences were held with the bishops, and negotiation proved as fruitless as ever. But there were some points of special interest. Among the lamentations of the laity over ecclesiastical grievances the first place was given to the handful of deprived nonconforming clergy. They had many complaints, e.g. that they were slanderously said to be repudiators of the royal supremacy; they were put out by trickery and false pleas, and, in defiance of their appeals, by judges not competent, by

sentences pronounced in "the Ounce and Ivy Bush" tavern. All these points and many old ones fortified with much legal ingenuity made up a specious case, and secured for them prominent supporters. While many urged their restoration, the voice of one stalwart knight, Sir Richard Spencer, was heard to utter words "against the overweening opinion of some ministers," and to maintain both that the Church had the right to adapt discipline to times and places, and that "ceremonies agreed upon by a general convocation were not to be subject to any private man." The boldness in defence of church principle that was manifested during the last sessions in the Lower House of Convocation had at last manifested itself for a moment in the Lower House of Parliament also.

When the subject came up in the conference between the two Houses, the archbishop had much to say in defence of the proceedings and in demonstration of the irreconcilable character of the opposition. But the Commons went on to formulate a fourfold petition to the Crown: one part of this was dictated by zeal against recusancy; the remaining parts pleaded, first, for the toleration of non-conformity, so far that law-abiding preachers might, though deprived, not be silenced; secondly, for the abolishing of pluralities and the restraint of non-residence; and thirdly, for the reform of excommunication. Bancroft had already gone as far as he felt justified in going to meet the second demand; with regard to the third and fourth he was already attempting some reforms on the Church's behalf. He was busy with a reform in the matter of excommunication by the ecclesiastical courts, such as had been promised at Hampton Court; and further, he had planned to improve the impoverished benefices by extending tithe to include mineral products, and by redeeming and recovering impropriations with the help of a parliamentary subsidy. For the latter plan he could hardly have hoped to find much support; and even the former, though promoted by the king and passed by the Lords, was rejected with much distaste the moment it descended to the Commons on May 22. This was but tit for tat; for earlier in May the Lords had rejected a bill from the Commons intended "to restrain the execution of canons ecclesiastical not confirmed by parliament." Thus

and Bancroft's
attempt at
redress.

the same cross purposes were manifested as at the previous session.

The temper of the House was further manifested by another incident. In the course of the last session some Marian acts had been repealed in order to legalise the marriage of priests, which had not hitherto been legalised formally. It was now suggested that by this repeal the Edwardine act had been revived, under which bishops were appointed, without election, by a mere writ of the Crown, and that therefore the existing bishops were illegally appointed and had no real status or jurisdiction. The suggestion was subtle and too clever, but it was taken up by some, in order to serve as a stick with which puritan lawyers might beat the bishops; and, in fact, it was not finally disposed of till 1637.

An attack on
the legal
position
of the
episcopate.

While parliament was thus discordant the convocations were too fatally harmonious. On receiving the royal license to make canons they agreed upon a strange tractate, with canons appended to the greater number of its chapters, *Concerning the Government of God's Catholic Church and the kingdoms of the whole world*. It can best be described as an elaborate interpretation of the events recorded in the Old and New Testaments, and of subsequent Church history, constructed with the object of condemning sectaries, papists, and impugnors of the divine right of kings. It was thus meant to be a reply to the political theories of Parsons, and to the elaborate edifice that Baronius and Bellarmine had been constructing for the defence of the papacy, and to define the Anglican *via media* between them and the attack of the Presbyterians on the other flank. So far as the document was theological and ecclesiastical it might have stood; but as an elaborate attempt to intrench the royal prerogative against its foes it was not at all acceptable to James. He refused his assent to the canons—if canons they can be called,—and the whole remained unpublished until Sancroft issued it in 1689 under the title of *The Convocation Book of Bishop Overall*, a title derived from the fact that Overall, who in 1614 became Bishop of Lichfield, was prolocutor of the Lower House of the southern province at the time. The projects of the convocation thus

Convocation
and the code
called
"Overall's
Convocation
Book."

came to nothing. The two chief subjects, however, that had occupied its activity did not disappear. James was willing enough to put into practice an exaggerated claim to prerogative power, although he had not liked to see convocation formulate it as a political theory and defend it. His claims, therefore, continued and grew. Similarly, the ecclesiastical controversy between Church and parliament was bound to continue, and circumstances tended to increase rather than diminish it. In each case the main clash of conflict was to come hereafter in a wider field than in the convocation house.

When the sessions were over, attention was directed to the carrying out of the ecclesiastical policy indicated by parliament. With regard to the Puritans, the grievance of the deprived ministers died down. Effect of the legislation on puritans The bishops had conciliated all but the extreme section by reducing their requirement from a full subscription to a partial conformity; they had shown themselves ready to give time to, or even to make terms with, well-meaning men. The policy of the remainder of Bancroft's primacy was that sleeping dogs should be left to lie, though in some cases more was required of new-comers. A case that arose in the diocese of London acquired some notoriety, and exemplifies a new development. The bishop refused institution to Mr. Chope, whom Lord Rich presented to the benefice of South Shoebury. The case was then carried to the secular court, and went against the bishop. Thereupon the Puritans, elated with this success, failing to get redress from parliament in 1605, and finding the new session of 1606 fully occupied with disputes as to the union of England and Scotland, developed to an unprecedented extent the plan of appealing to the civil courts. They soon fanned into a flame the jealousy between the civil and ecclesiastical courts and lawyers, which seems inherent in the dual system, and which had of late shown signs of unusual fierceness. Thus, while controversy died down, and there was a sudden lull in the pamphlet war, this repose was more than counterbalanced by the contest raging round the law courts, and especially round the Court of High Commission.

The difficulty of dealing with the Recusants, on the other

hand, underwent no change of character, but only grew in dimensions. On the discovery of the powder plot there were signs of a cleavage among them. While ^{and} Blackwell the archpriest repudiated the attempt with ^{recusants.} horror, the tone of public opinion in some parts, and especially north of the Trent, was somewhat different, as might have been expected from the premonitory rumblings already described. It was reported from the diocese of Durham that it was the exception to disown the plot; and there were signs that the Recusants, though not privy to the details of the plot, had made preparations in view of some such attempt. As the inquiry went on, bitterness increased against Lord Salisbury. It was disseminated by a series of anonymous pamphlets charging him with making the most of the plot as an excuse for drastic dealings. These attacks culminated in a letter threatening to assassinate him, which he subsequently published with a reply. The letter may have been a vain threat, but such a conspiracy was much discussed and much credited. The reply in any case was far from satisfactory. It certainly diverged from the truth when it spoke as if there had been no increase in the severity of the penal laws. If Salisbury had confined himself to pointing out that the worst provisions of the new law, and especially the clause intended to punish absence from communion, on which the Commons had insisted, had not been put into execution, he would have been on safe ground. But the statements which he made put too great a strain both upon the credulity of his readers, and upon the ignorance of foreigners, if his reply, like a similar document of his father's, was produced for foreign consumption.

The Recusants had barely recovered from the scandal caused by Garnet's examination and the large defection to the national church which ensued upon the unravelling of the plot, when they received a further ^{New banishment of priests.} shock from a fresh proclamation, on July 10, 1606, for the banishment of their clergy. Pardon was offered to any, except Gerard or Greenway, who went voluntarily. There had lately been great activity in hunting down priests, and it had been directed to a considerable extent by seminaries who had conformed; consequently there were nearly

fifty ready to be collected out of the various prisons and deported.

The chief difficulty was the new oath. The terms of the act were published at the end of June, and there followed many discussions among the Recusants, some of whom thought it might be sworn, while others vehemently opposed such a course, and a third party sought a compromise. Archpriest Blackwell showed his instability by violently opposing the oath-taking at first, and even refusing to allow any conference on the subject, then subsequently suddenly changing his mind, calling a conference, and pronouncing in favour of allowing the oath to be taken. The numbers at the conference were equally divided, and no decision was reached, but the archpriest's view soon became known, and men began to act upon it. Three days later Blackwell relented, and wished to postpone action till a decision could be reached, and the question, being thus brought to a climax, was referred to Rome for solution.

Internal
divisions
about the
oath.

There could be little doubt what the answer would be. Parsons had already been agitating for the condemnation of the oath, not on its merits, but because the trail of the secular priests was across it. Paul V. himself was not likely to understand the situation or to enter into delicate negotiations to ameliorate it. His reply to "The English Catholics," dated September 22, 1606, could hardly have been more unfortunately phrased, for it condemned the oath as containing "many things obviously contrariant to faith and salvation," but did not specify what the things were. If he had been wise enough to leave room for negotiations, it is just possible that some formula might have been reached which would have satisfied all parties, though it is not very likely that such a compact could have been made, since Rome was not as yet prepared to abate its claims, nor England as yet to grant toleration. But as it was, the reply nipped in the bud the attempt to discriminate between religion and politics, from which alone there could come any mitigation of the panic of the people at large, or of the miseries of the Recusants. The latter were now more firmly than ever wedged in "between the devil and the deep

Rome con-
demns it,
September
1606.

sea." Henceforward it was of little use to propound alternative formulas, as was done; for though the English government might be disposed to accept one if it would serve as a guarantee of loyalty, there was no encouragement to suppose that the pope would sanction any.

In spite of the papal breve many followed Blackwell's view and took the oath, including all the recusant peers but one. Numbers reverted to the old attitude of compromise about church-going and attending their parish churches. But in a body, whose strength lay in its uncompromising constancy under persecution, it was inevitable that the rigorists would lead, and the laxer party would either follow, or else depart and conform to the English Church, as indeed many did. This settlement, however, was made only slowly. Blackwell maintained his position for a whole year, refrained from publishing the breve when it arrived in November 1606, and allowed its genuineness to be disputed; finally, when he discovered in prison that the government had the fullest information of all the recusant dealings, he himself actually took the oath, and wrote to his clergy on July 7, 1607, urging them to follow his example and instruct the laity to do the same. All this called forth a new breve from the pope of August 23, authenticating and confirming the former document. A month later a remonstrance followed, addressed to Blackwell by Cardinal Bellarmine, who thus made his appearance on the field of English controversy. It found Blackwell still in prison, but he was allowed to remit a learned reply. At the beginning of February in the year following, a further blow fell upon him. By a fresh papal breve he was deposed from his office, and Birkhead appointed in his place. The questions of the oath and of church attendance were thus decided according to the rigorist view.

The arrival of the breves had only served to aggravate the feeling against the Recusants, and to intensify the persecution of those who remained unbending. The new system of confiscation was speedily at work, and to increase the odium of it the profits were utilised as a form of royal pension. The benefit of the recusancy of such and such a landowner was granted to needy Scottish courtiers and other royal dependants, to the great indignation of the House

The condemnation is repudiated by Blackwell, and he is deposed.

The depths of recusant misery

of Commons, which had not foreseen such a result when it devised the penalty. Lord Hay had the profits from ten recusants, and many other courtiers were scheduled before the end of the year for grants of this character in less degree. In a short time the list was very greatly enlarged, and each recusant of substance was at the mercy of some harpy. The taking of the oath did not exempt the unfortunate men from their penalties, but varying bargains were made with those who yielded to the demand of the statute or who agreed to take some modification of the statutory oath. A great cry of misery arose, partly at the banishment from home, but more still at the penury to which recusants of all classes were now reduced. While the puritan midlands protested against the leniency shown to Jesuits and seminaries, the priests and prisoners could hardly get enough to live on, and the new archpriest himself failed to raise more than £60 during his first half year of office.

A single instance will probably serve to describe the position better than any general portrayal, however picturesque; and a case comes now to hand which will serve as a exemplified by T. Pound, courtier, summary of recusant persecution from the beginning up to this climax. Thomas Pound of Belmont is a figure that continually reappears on the tragic scene. Born in 1538, of a good family in Hampshire, he was educated at Winchester and Oxford. After a distinguished career there he was summoned to Court, where his wit, grace, and ability made him a prominent figure in the gaities. A fiasco as a Christmas entertainment in 1569 turned his mind to serious things. Leaving the Court, he went home, renounced his conformity to the English Church, and after two years spent in penitential exercises as a punishment for his sins, aspired to be a priest and a Jesuit. He found a kindred spirit in Steevens, who, though passing as his servant, was really his comrade; and together they underwent their first imprisonment at Ludlow in 1570 or 1571, on suspicion of being spies. This lasted no longer than one morning; but three years later, as the two were in London on the eve of going abroad to the Society, Pound was arrested. He had made himself too conspicuous in London by visits of charity and proselytism, and he was sent to the Marshalsea. After six months, by the

influence of his kinsman, the Earl of Southampton, he was sent home on bail; but after sixteen months of liberty he was taken by the Bishop of Winchester in December 1575, and imprisoned, first at Winchester and then again at the Marshalsea.

There special efforts were made to recover him, but meanwhile he was seeking through Steevens the entry to the Jesuit order which he had so long coveted. In 1578 he was admitted as a lay-brother while still in prison. Jesuit lay-brother,
Two years later he was entangled in controversy with two ministers sent to visit the prison, and acquitting himself too gallantly, he was sent off elsewhere—first to Stortford, and then to Wisbeach. His present acquaintance with that famous prison was short, for on the capture of Campion in 1581, he was sent back to the Tower to be examined with him. This distinction he owed to the prominent part which the laxity of discipline in the Marshalsea had allowed him to play in the early doings of the first Jesuit Mission, and especially to his part in the dissemination of Campion's *Ten Reasons*.

At the end of 1585 came a brief term of enlargement after eleven years of nearly continuous prison. He was sent out, and restricted to his mother's house at Kennington, except that the Council gave him leave to make ^{and sufferer.} two brief visits a year to his estates in Hampshire, by which it secured the regular payment of his fines. But soon a new term of imprisonment began. Within two years he was incarcerated in the White Lion prison; and then deported again for "a ten years' sojourn at Wisbeach, where he remained during a great part of the "stirs," until he exchanged it for three years in the Tower and two at Framlingham. The general pardon on the king's accession released him; but again his respite was short. He was led to make a bold protest to the king against unjust dealings with recusants in the Lancashire assizes in December 1604. This led to a convening in the Star Chamber, and a sentence condemning him to pay a large fine and to be pilloried as a slanderer at Westminster and at Lancaster. The sentence was apparently remitted; but he made the acquaintance of two new London prisons besides the Tower, with which he was already familiar, and from the Fleet his pathetic petition went forth to the king.

He was now 68 years of age; he had passed half his life in captivity, had been sixteen times in prison, and thrice in irons, while his fines had amounted to over £5000.

His petition
for mercy,

No breath of suspicion had sullied his loyalty; his only crimes had been his religion first of all, next his connexion with the Jesuits, and beyond that his proselytising zeal, and his generous support by word and money of his unfortunate fellow-sufferers. The petition was heard, and he was discharged when the banishment of the priests took place in

July 1606. The remaining eleven years of his long life were more peaceful. He had liberty to return

home, and even obtained leave at last to go abroad to the Society; but his superiors willed otherwise, and he lived on in his old home, which he had handed over to his nephews, afflicted by no worse evil than the voracity of those who had "the benefit of his recusancy." The story had no tragic ending, but in truth his lot was almost more lamentable than the swift fate which overtook his hero in the Society, Edmund Campion, or the despairing suicide after torture of his poor little lay-brother Nicholas Owen.

During this cyclone of persecution there was little actual bloodshed. Robert Davey alone suffered in 1607, and in the following year two of the banished priests that had returned. Then came a spell of milder policy. The king directed action to be forbore, except against those specially obstinate, and in consequence no executions took place. But they were resumed when panic took hold of the country at the assassination of Henry IV. of France by Ravallac in 1610. Parliament petitioned for a renewal of severities, a fresh proclamation and a new deportation ensued, and four priests met their death. After this outbreak came another change; but sporadic executions in 1612, 1616, and 1618 claimed ten more victims before the catalogue of recusant executions of the reign was complete.

Execution of
recusants.

AUTHORITIES.—The State Papers contain much material about the Powder Plot; this is digested by Jardine, *Narrative*; Gardiner, *Hist.*; questioned by Gerard, *What was Gunpowder Plot?* and resited by Gardiner's reply, *What Gunpowder Plot was.*

Papers about severity with recusants are in *S.P. Dom.* xii., xiv. Tierney's *Dodd* has valuable documents as to Garnet and Blackwell and the oath of allegiance. For Garnet's trial see *State Trials*; and for the question of the

seal of confession, Badeley, *Privilege of Rel. Confession*. Cp. *S.P. Dom.* xix.-xxi. For Sicklemore, *S.P. Dom.* xviii. 66. For Parliament see *S.P. Dom.* xviii. 54; xix. 27, 85; xx. 36, 57. Cp. Yonge, *Diary* (Camden Soc.). For the "benefits of recusancy" see *S.P. Dom.* xviii. etc. For Pound see *Jesuits in Conflict*, Winwood, and the petition in *S.P. Dom.* xxi. 48. Other documents of his case are in Bodley's Library, MS. Rawlinson, R. 320. For the milder policy in 1608 see *S.P. Dom.* xxxvii. 28. For Choep's case see the *Survey of the B.C.P.* (edition of 1610).

CHAPTER XX

CONFLICTS—CONTROVERSIAL AND JUDICIAL

FROM the beginning of the seventeenth century onward controversy with Rome was carried on upon two different levels. In the early days of Elizabeth, Jewel had represented the better class of apologist, but he had had no proper successor. The level dropped, partly because men knew less how to defend the English Church, but even more because they did not know what that was which they had to defend. From a want of ability to distinguish what was sound from what was unsound in the provisional settlement of the moment, they were continually attempting to find arguments to justify what was incidental and unjustifiable; and indeed the Church could hardly do itself justice so long as it entrusted its defence to puritans like Dering or to Calvinists like Whitaker. The controversy was lifted from this level by the influence of the rising school of Cambridge theologians: they, following in the wake of Jewel, with no less knowledge than his and with more mature judgment, worked out in detailed application the foundation principles of reformation which the Church had instinctively seized upon as being its true guides, without being able at first to see for itself, or to state for others, exactly what reconstruction they would involve. They saw, as earlier reformers had not been so well able to see, what was involved in the appeal to Scripture, what was the authority of the Church of the day, and what was the present value of its own past experience, and especially of the precedents set by the primitive and undivided Church.

Cambridge in the earlier years of the reign had been the

Two levels
of Roman
controversy.

home of the progressive party, just as Oxford had favoured conservatism. For a time Geneva instilled into it a hatred for the system represented by the prayer-book, and Calvin fascinated it with his systematic theology. When Mildmay founded Emmanuel College to be the stronghold of puritanism in 1584, it seemed as if the whole influence of the university was to be thrown into that scale. But at the end of the century a rebellion, which had long been preparing, broke out against Calvinism. Some account of one side of it has already been given. It also affected the field of controversy, when William Perkins, though a convinced puritan, was led by his liberality and charity to bridge the way back to the higher level by his book called *The Reformed Catholicke*; while in constructive theology a brilliant young scholar from Pembroke was giving systematic lectures and theological teaching by which he not only convinced the minds of his audience, but also profoundly influenced their hearts and lives.

The Cambridge theology.

This was Lancelot Andrewes, born in 1555, the son of a London shipman, and educated at Merchant Taylors' School, from which he went in 1571, at the age of 16, to Pembroke Hall, just when Whitgift had routed the Genevan doctrine in the person of Cartwright.

Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626).

In 1578 he was appointed catechist, and gave in the college, to an increasingly large audience, the lectures which were posthumously published as *A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine*. After his ordination, in 1580, he began to lay the foundation of his great reputation as a preacher. This drew him away into the larger world, and he accepted preferment in London as Vicar of St. Giles', Cripplegate, in 1588. In the following year Pembroke claimed him as master; but London had already tightened its hold, for he had recently in May become prebendary and penitentiary at St. Paul's cathedral.

From this point onward he was a conspicuous figure wherever he went: in the pulpit he attracted great audiences, for he combined wit with learning, and a singular gift of exposition with an ideal pulpit style. In St. Paul's he made the office of penitentiary a reality, and many sought his spiritual counsel. No one stood so good a chance as he of recovering either recusant or

His influence in general,

sectary; his dealings with Barrow have already been mentioned; Dingley the seminarist chose him as the man with whom he would soonest confer; and Udall, though unconvinced by his arguments, was charmed by his character.

Meanwhile at Cambridge the school of Andrewes had begun to triumph; and its leader's trenchant criticism of the Lambeth Articles did much to prevent Whitgift's temporary *modus vivendi* from acquiring any official status or permanence. From St. Paul's he passed to Westminster, being first prebendary there and then dean; and so he remained till the end of Elizabeth's reign; for he was not one who, when a bishopric was offered to him, was prepared to pay the price expected for it. After James's succession all this altered, and the offer of the see of Chichester, with no unworthy conditions attached, came to him in the midst of his labours upon the new translation of the Bible; he accepted, and was consecrated on November 3, 1605.

Such was the founder of the Cambridge movement and the inaugurator of a new level of Anglican theology. It is

difficult to estimate the effect of his teaching on the quiet consolidation of faith and deepening of piety; it is easier to gauge it by its influence upon controversy; and thus he, who by nature was as far removed

as possible from a controversialist, was not only forced to deal with the religious prisoners and to write controversial books in his lifetime, but has also after his death to be largely judged by them.

It was high time that the controversy should find some one to ennoble it; not only were the performances of the

advocates of the English Church unworthy of her, but her opponents were now men of specially distinguished calibre. The quality of the ordinary English

"seminaries" had indeed greatly deteriorated; the recusant laity complained of them as unlearned and insufficient, and the archpriest acknowledged their powerlessness against "the heretique, who groweth everyday more potent, politique, prudent and crafty." But the effect of this decay was to enlist the services of the great scholars abroad, till Bellarmine himself, who, by the publication of his *Disputationes adversus Hereticos* in 1587, had become the Goliath of the Roman Church, was

put forward as champion on the English battlefield. The relics of the later Elizabethan style of controversy still dragged on into the new reign. Parsons was as prolific as ever, and was able to spare enough time from his war with the Secular Priests to keep up a controversy with Sir Francis Hastings. When Whitaker had died in the midst of the rebellion against Calvinism at Cambridge in 1595, Matthew Sutcliffe had been ready at hand to take his place as coryphaeus of the lower apologists and to rival his productivity. Similarly, Thomas Bell the ex-seminary took up the mantle that fell from Nichols and gave a new spice to the old enmity by fouling the nest that he had lately left. Other skirmishing continued, and in particular a challenge sent out by Thomas Hill in 1600 still produced answers. But of the controversial works of the last century the *Reformed Catholike* of Dr. Perkins attracted most attention. The chief feature of interest about it is its liberal tone: though written by a puritan it aimed at making much of the amount of belief common to both sides, and of reducing within as narrow a compass as possible the difference between them. The title however was enough to provoke the Recusants: the *Reformed Catholike* was nicknamed the *Deformed Catholike*, and reformed by William Bishop under the initials of D. B. P.; then defended by Wotton and again by Abbot; and then finally attacked in Bishop's *Reproof of Dr. Abbot's Defence* (1608), to which Abbot issued a rejoinder in 1609.

By this time all the chief controversy had come to centre round the Oath of Allegiance, and the king himself had entered disguised into the arena with his *Apology for the Oath*. He had to back him a confederation of the Cambridge scholars, who had already been busy with the better kind of controversy. Thomas Morton was the first champion whom they had put forward, and his publications in 1605 mark the beginning of the new school; but behind him again lay the learning and ripe judgment of Andrewes. The book that James sent forth anonymously to the world in 1607, first in English and then in Latin, had the Latin title *Triplici Nodo Triplex Cuneus*. The object of its attack was to be found in the two papal breves and Bellarmine's letter to Blackwell. Each

though the
lower con-
tinued.

The fight
about the
Oath of
Allegiance.

of these was cited in turn and censured, the last having the lion's share of the book, which, compared with the rest of the controversial literature of the day, was of modest dimensions, consisting barely of 100 octavo pages. The authorship of the reply, which appeared in the year following, was equally thinly veiled, for the *Responsio*, though issued under the name of the chaplain, Matthew Tortus, was known to be by the hand of the master, Bellarmine. Thus the arena was of European dimensions. In 1609 the king republished his book with his own name under its second title, *Apologia pro Juramento Fidelitatis*, prefixing to it an exhortation to the emperor and all rulers and princes of the Christian world to make common cause with him against the pope's interference with the rights of government: and thereupon the controversy attracted universal interest.

James' able but pedantic mind had been deeply moved by his venture. The reply of Tortus excited him even further, and wounded him not a little. It was beneath his own dignity to answer a chaplain; but when he called in Andrewes to undertake the reply the Court applauded, and every one approved but the bishop himself. It was felt to be doubtful "how he would undertake to perform the task, being so contrary to his disposition and course to meddle with controversy"; but, whether distasteful or not, the bishop had gone through long training for such a task, and those who knew him best knew that it could not be trusted to safer hands.

Unfortunately he was tied down to the course which the king had begun and the cardinal had followed; and it was not a very inspiring one. James had persuaded himself that the oath, being a way of distinguishing loyal from disloyal, was a beneficent measure, and one that concerned only matters of civil obedience. He therefore confined himself to the narrow issue raised by the oath, and complained that the pope's condemnation of it was a general attack on the rights of kings as well as a personal insult to himself. This very partial treatment left out of sight the general question of the penal laws, the oath of supremacy, the fines, imprisonments, executions—things which the Recusants or their defenders were not likely to

Andrewes is
called in.

The course
of the
dispute

leave unhandled. Consequently Tortus in his reply took wider ground, refused to consider the oath of allegiance as an isolated question, or to allow the king's claim that nothing was involved but civil obedience. On the contrary, he claimed that the new oath raised the whole question of papal authority, and, therefore, touched the centre of religion as understood by the Recusants. When ^{diverted by him to wider ground} Andrewes intervened he took up this point in his *Tortura Torti* and moved the centre of the battle from the special to the general ground, maintaining that the primacy of the pope is not *de fide catholica*, and that, therefore, even supposing the oath to be incompatible with holding the primacy of the pope, it was not incompatible with the catholic faith.

Thus the result of the main issue was that the imposers of the oath said it was a civil matter, while the refusers said it was a religious matter,—just as ever since Campion's day the victims had protested on the scaffold that they died for religion, while the authorities had replied ^{with but partial success.} that they were executed for treason; and so the wheels of the controversy sank down into the old ruts, from which not even the wit and learning of Andrewes could raise them. For, in fact, there was still too much of the medieval spirit in society for such an escape to be possible,—too much of the spirit of Charlemagne to allow civil governments to acquiesce in ecclesiastical dissidence, and too much of the spirit of Hildebrand to allow ecclesiastical or spiritual governments, whether papal, episcopal, or presbyterian, to keep clear of political interference.

But though Andrewes could not pull the controversy out of the rut, he did much to give it a better quality. The personalities which were customary were graced with wit, the irrelevance of some sections of his ^{The character of his polemic.} task was redeemed by much that was central and valuable. The direct discussion of the claims of the pope to primacy in general and the deposing power in particular was no longer evaded but fairly entered on, and the crude views of Bellarmine as to the meaning of the English doctrine of the royal supremacy were ridiculed and rebutted. When the cardinal had written to Blackwell that "the authority of the head of the Church had been transferred in England from

the successor of St. Peter to the successor of Henry VIII.," he made a clever appeal to the gallery, which, then as since, had a certain popular success. But he laid himself open to a penetrating retort from a skilled fencer like Andrewes. He repudiated such a view of the royal supremacy as a calumny and an invention, and made it clear even to the intelligence of the gallery that England, on recovering the usurped supremacy from the pope, gave no spiritual headship to the Crown, but only restored to it its ecclesiastical supremacy, while the spiritual supremacy—the power to define the faith, to prescribe and reform the worship, to celebrate, to ordain, to censure, and so forth—reverted to the spiritual heads, the bishops and archbishops, from whom the papacy had absorbed it.

When Bellarmine put out in his own name a reply, called *Apologia pro Responsione sua*, acknowledging the authorship of Tortus' *Responsio* and attacking James' preface to his second edition, Andrewes, being once again set to work, reverted to the same topic of the supremacy in his *Responsio ad Apologiam Card.*

Bellarmini. Here he deserts the former lines of the controversy, and contents himself mainly with two points,—the catholicity of the English Church, which James had asserted and Bellarmine had denied, and the doctrines of the royal supremacy and the papal primacy, which had already been incidentally handled. The treatment in his hands is more thorough, more positive and constructive. The negative attacks on Rome and the crude defences of protestantism are alike discarded: in their place comes the unhesitating assertion of the catholicity of the English position as witnessed, for example, by the Vincentian canon *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, or by the appeal to the example of primitive antiquity; and with this there is coupled an exposure of the unauthoritative character of the medieval Roman doctrines put forward by Bellarmine as tests of catholicity, when tried by these standards.

The controversy thus extended to the year 1610, which then witnessed a new contribution from another unexpected quarter and from a person of conspicuous interest. John Donne was, like Andrewes, a Londoner by origin, but he

Bellarmino's
Apologia and
Andrewes'
Responsio.

had been brought up in the midst of recusancy and under the influence of Jasper Heywood, his uncle, who had been the first Jesuit provincial in England (1581-1584). Towards the end of his uncle's tenure of that office Donne was sent to Oxford, whence he passed to London society, legal studies, a clandestine marriage, and a period of disfavour, suspicion, and want. Subsequently he emerged, when his domestic affairs were settled and his conformity established, into a popular position at Court, based, somewhat precariously, upon his wit, his learning, his good fellowship, and his poetic genius. His liberal view of the controversies of the day attracted James' notice, and at the royal command he put forth, in 1610, his *Pseudo-Martyr*. It was a lengthy denial of the papal claim and of the recusant victim's title to "martyrdom."

Others take
a share,
notably
Donne
(1573-1631).

Donne had spent the greater part of his thirty-seven years of life in omnivorous study; divinity came to him like the rest, and preponderated as time went on; but it was not till five years later, in 1615, that he was ordained and began to prove himself worthy to stand by Andrewes not only upon the controversial platform but also in the pulpit: the literary grace and poetic genius which had distinguished his younger days did not desert him here; while they exalted him almost to Andrewes' level, they served to differentiate him markedly from the older preacher. In 1616 he became preacher at Lincoln's Inn, among the legal surroundings where his earlier lot had been cast: he left this pulpit in 1621, though the benchers retained him among their fellowship at the Inn, to be Dean of St. Paul's, where he remained till his death in 1631. The *Pseudo-Martyr*, though not his first, was happily his last effort in controversy: in this respect he was more fortunate than Andrewes, who, after his reply to Bellarmine, was dragged back years later to quench the flame which Cardinal du Perron had fanned out of the smouldering embers that were left of the controversy about the oath.

His history.

During all this period the meaner style of controversy continued to thrive upon its lower level: it was valuable though not distinguished, and at one time James thought to endow a college at Chelsea in order that it might be systematically carried on under the auspices of

The lower
level of
controversy.

Sutcliffe as dean : but the project soon decayed and disappeared. When the grand drama was revived and it was again necessary to secure a protagonist, he was found not among the professed controversialists, but again among the general body of learned prelates, in the person of William Laud.

While these struggles were being maintained with persons outside, there was much other fighting of an internal kind going on. In contending for his view of the prerogative, James's chief opponent was the parliament, and from the point of view of the constitutional history of the state there is nothing of greater interest in this period than the conflict between the royal prerogative and the growing power of parliament. To a certain extent also James was brought into collision with the judges in matters judicial as well as legislative and administrative. In this sphere too a considerable development was going forward which was not accomplished without conflict, while the judges were also embroiled in the quarrels of Crown and parliament. The greater part of these struggles lies outside the special range of ecclesiastical history : but there is one division of it which bulks large within that range.

The dual system of ecclesiastical and civil law which had subsisted in England ever since the Norman conquest was still in force, and had been undisturbed in the larger part of its workings by the changes of the Reformation. The reassertion of royal supremacy had, however, not been without effect. It brought out into relief the old theory of England, which had been obscured to some extent by the prevalence of appeals in English ecclesiastical suits to Rome, that the king is head of causes ecclesiastical as well as civil ; that in him, like two converging lines, these two systems of law and court and justice finally meet ; and that the ecclesiastical law and system of justice, however much it may have in common with the system of foreign countries and of the papal court,—however much it may have adopted of the canon law of the western Church, or even of specific papal decretals,—is, as used in England, the king's law, or the canon law of the realm. Beyond re-establishing this principle of the co-ordination of the two systems, the Reformation had made

but little change: it had established a royal court to receive the appeals from the ecclesiastical courts that formerly had gone to Rome: it had continued the operation of the old canon law with the proviso—always understood, but now repeated with a new emphasis and scope—that it be not contrary to the law of the realm.

The old ecclesiastical system of law had thus been in working order ever since Mary recovered it from the anarchy of Edward's days. The archbishops held their provincial courts and the bishops their diocesan courts, and therein was carried on by them or their officials The system of ecclesiastical law, all the legal business which the middle ages classed as ecclesiastical, *i.e.* not only matters of the spiritual sphere and of church discipline in worship, faith, and morals, but such matters as the probate of wills, matrimonial disputes, and payment of tithe. Besides the episcopal courts there were also the inferior courts that had grown up since Norman times: most of the archdeacons held courts, and there was always one archdeacon and sometimes more in each diocese: even rural deans performed some judicial business by virtue of delegation from the bishop who appointed them and from the archdeacon whose deputies they were. Besides these courts, there were the local courts of places exempt from the ordinary jurisdiction and of peculiars, which, though they became troublesome anomalies, had once been of practical convenience: so that in all it was calculated that the number of ecclesiastical courts amounted to more than two hundred and fifty.

The same border frays as of old continued on or about the frontier between the two systems: in former days legislation had done its best in such measures as the writ of *Circumspecte agatis* of 1285 and the *Articuli Cleri* of 1316 and the conflicts with the civil system by prohibitions. for the delimitation of the territories: writs of prohibition had emanated from the civil court to bar proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts when they seemed to it to be taking too much upon themselves. The tension which such expedients imply did not diminish; and at the beginning of James's reign border forays gave way to pitched battles. The ecclesiastical lawyers reckoned up prohibitions to the number of 477 sent into the provincial Court of Arches alone, not only from Chancery but also from the King's Bench

and the Common Pleas, during Elizabeth's time: the number was increasing rather than diminishing: and it was high time for a protest against this aggression of the civil judges.

It was not only the ecclesiastical courts that were harassed by it: civil courts with local jurisdiction, such as the Council

Prohibitions
also harass
civil courts.

of the North or of Wales, were similarly hampered, and made similar protests against the aggression. To a certain extent, no doubt, this growing claim of the temporal courts represented a legitimate and needful movement towards centralisation and simplification: but it proceeded also from a less laudable desire for supremacy; and when, in 1606, Coke became Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, he brought all the ability and learning and ambition of which he was possessed to forward this movement; indeed, he seemed to desire to make the judges a new estate of the realm, which should have the last word in all great disputes, and even decide between king and parliament.

On the other hand, there was much dissatisfaction with the execution of the ecclesiastical law, as the pages of this history have more than once borne witness. The procedure

Complaints
against the
ecclesiastical
courts,

of the ecclesiastical courts was open to grave question; the infliction of their spiritual censures, and especially the excommunication for trivial offences, such as a mere breach of technical procedure, rightly caused great scandal. Both procedure and censures were adapted to a discipline which professed to be parental, spiritual, and non-coercive; but ecclesiastical discipline had ceased to be that. Men saw a lay judge sit as the bishop's delegate and proceed against a supposed offender, who, as constantly happened, was neither accused by any one nor presented by churchwarden or other officer, but was charged by the judge *ex officio mero*—merely by right of his position as judge; they then heard him excommunicate the offender for refusing to answer on oath a number of incriminating questions, which most probably he had not been allowed to see; finally, they witnessed him invoke the aid of Chancery in order that the sheriff might lay the offender by the heels and lodge him in prison; and when all was done they failed to trace in it any vestiges of the spiritual dealings of a Father in God with his children. What wonder that there were outcries at these stringencies, as well as at the

laxities by which the guilty escaped altogether, or compounded for their penance by payment of a fine? What wonder that the civil judges should welcome opportunities of interfering with proceedings thus discredited?

But it was not with the regular ecclesiastical courts that the worst quarrels arose: the Court of High Commission was much more attacked, and it occupied a much less defensible position. It was a piece of machinery ^{and the court of the ecclesiastical commission,} for executing the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, differing in some respects from the previous machinery of the latter days of Henry, the reign of Edward, or the first days of Mary. Henry had exercised this ecclesiastical authority (secured to him by 26 Henry VIII. c. 1) mainly by temporary visitations, which for the moment suspended the episcopal exercise of jurisdiction, just as a metropolitanical visitation involved the suspension of the jurisdiction of the suffragan sees for the time. Edward had made the bishops mere executive officers of the Crown, so that nothing was done by the episcopal courts, but all by the royal authority. After Mary had restored episcopal authority, Elizabeth did not revert to Edward's policy; but the clause in the Supremacy Act which created the ecclesiastical commission put on a statutable and permanent basis the exercise of the royal authority, which till then had operated only as a part of the prerogative; while at the same time being permanent and statutable, it did not involve the suspension of the ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Thus the Court of High Commission had taken up a place side by side with the ancient ecclesiastical courts—an ecclesiastical court like them and yet not like them, for it embodied the exercise of royal and not spiritual control over ecclesiastical causes. It thus occupied ^{which occupied a mixed position.} a mixed position. It was to be occupied with "all such errors, etc., spiritual and ecclesiastical, which by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power . . . may lawfully be reformed." Its procedure was to follow that of the ecclesiastical court in inquiry as well as that of the civil court; for it had power, according to the letters-patent, not only to try by jury and call witnesses against persons accused, but also to proceed, as in ecclesiastical cases, by accusation, by presentation, and by oath against persons suspect. Originally, in 1559, there was no

express mention of the infliction of any ecclesiastical censures : punishment was to be "by fine, imprisonment, or otherwise," the disobedient were to be committed to ward, the offenders to be bound by recognisances to obedience. But in the instrument appointing the second commission of 1562 four insertions were made prescribing ecclesiastical censures and renewing the mention of fine among the penalties to be inflicted. These clauses had continued in the later commissions, both general and local, down to the end of the reign, and thus the Court of High Commission combined the terrors of both the secular and the ecclesiastical arms.

To a modern judgment it would be the infliction of ecclesiastical censures that would seem questionable under such circumstances. For a court, representing the The justification of this. Crown, based on an act of parliament and constituted by letters-patent, to excommunicate, would seem at other epochs a dubious if not a horrible and sacrilegious proceeding : but it was not so at this epoch. According to the theory which then held the field, the king, being the person in whom the ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdictions were united, could order the performance of spiritual acts though he could not himself perform them : he could punish an offender just as he could appoint a bishop, by ordering excommunication in the one case and consecration in the other.

But the point that then seemed questionable in connexion with the ecclesiastical commission was its infliction of fine and imprisonment, being civil and not ecclesiastical penalties. The case was rendered more acute by the fact that there was no appeal from this court : The complaints against the High Commission from the ordinary ecclesiastical courts an appeal always lay to the king in Chancery as represented by a Court of special Delegates appointed to hear the appeal : but the judgment of the commissioners was irreformable. Further, the ecclesiastical commission to a large degree superseded other courts : the central commission in London was a court of first instance, and drew to itself causes from the whole country : the local commissions in the several dioceses or districts equally superseded the local courts. Men who looked on with comparative indifference while the judges of assize ruined, imprisoned, and condemned to death a multitude of

recusants on one side and a handful of conspicuous sectaries on the other, were indignant when they saw novel courts, consisting normally of no more than a bishop and two ecclesiastical lawyers, exercising a widespread and inquisitorial discipline, with penal results, not only over such recusant persons, and over moral offenders, but over scrupulous ministers and well-meaning but over-zealous reformers: while the lawyers, probing the matter legally, challenged in turn their powers, their procedure, and their penalties.

No doubt there was a defence for such proceedings, and from time to time that defence was made, and made effectually. Speaking technically, the courts were not going beyond the powers as conferred on them by letters-patent, and their procedure was not in itself novel or reprehensible. Speaking practically, as Parker spoke when he defended the Court against the attack of the Puritans at the time of the *Admonitions to Parliament*, or as Whitgift had spoken in his answer to Burghley's letter (p. 229), in his memorandum to the Crown at the beginning of his primacy, or in his speech during the Hampton Court Conference at the end of his days, there were many good reasons for this unusual jurisdiction. Mere ecclesiastical censures had come to be disregarded, especially by the Puritans; the rich escaped condemnation by terrorising the local courts or by evading into another diocese; and as Whitgift put it, "The whole ecclesiastical law is a carcase without a soul if it be not in the want supplied by the commission."

Thus while the ordinary ecclesiastical courts were hampered by the growing prohibitions and consultations, the Court of the Commission was exposed not only to legal attack from the civil lawyers, but to the far more serious danger of a rising protest from the general public, which was driven to resentment by a diffused sense of injustice. The former contest came to a head in the earlier years of James's reign, and victory rested to a large extent with the ecclesiastical lawyers. In the other contest, though a good deal was now done to curb the commission, the main fight came later on, aggravated by additional years of unreformed grievance: and the result of it was the abolition of the court in 1640 amid popular execration and

The rising
tide of
protest
against it.

rejoicings. Meanwhile in both respects the ecclesiastics threw themselves upon the royal power for support, and made common cause with those who were encouraging the king in an exaggerated confidence in his royal prerogative. The defence of the genuine ecclesiastical jurisdiction thus became combined with the defence of the bastard jurisdiction of the Commission, and was made to rest not on its proper basis, viz. the spiritual authority inherent in the episcopate, but on untenable royal claims: it thus came to share their odium and their fall.

These differences had long been the subject of legal controversy, and especially since, in 1592, two pamphlets had appeared, *A Brief Treatise of Oaths* and *Notes to prove the Proceedings ex officio . . . to be against the Word of God*, etc. Dr. Cosin, Dean of Arches, had replied to these in his *Apology* from the lawyer's point of view, and Andrewes had given at Cambridge a *Theological Determination* on the same side. The controversy as to the oath had to a certain extent been decided, for the civil judges had upheld the commissioners in their custom of demanding that the examinee should take the oath before he saw the questions which he swore to answer. So thereupon the main burden of controversy shifted from the question of procedure to that of penalty—from Grindal's use of the jury and Whitgift's of the oath to the fine and imprisonment which the commissioners had all along inflicted. Actual cases of prohibition, by which, in Elizabeth's time, civil courts had released those whom the commissioners had imprisoned, rankled more in the mind of the ecclesiastical lawyers than the theoretical controversy: and though in bulk the prohibitions which concerned the scope and cognisance of the ordinary ecclesiastical courts were far the more considerable, those which concerned the penalties inflicted by the commission were more crucial in importance.

Bancroft did not fail to observe that the number of prohibitions of the new reign was more, not less, than in the last. Fired by two particular cases in which recently an adulterer imprisoned by the commission had been set free by the King's Bench, and a depraver of bishops by the Court of Common Pleas, he pre-

The legal controversy was of old standing, both theoretical and practical.

Bancroft protests against the prohibitions.

sented to the Privy Council at the end of 1605 five-and-twenty *Articles of Abuses* connected with the granting of prohibitions. These were based on earlier complaints made fruitlessly in 1598; they dealt with all the technicalities involved in the prohibitions granted against the ordinary ecclesiastical courts, and, to a less degree, with the special circumstances of the Court of High Commission. With the fights over technicalities it is not necessary to deal here; they were lawyers' squabbles, minute but capable of being very vexatious, immensely interesting in a legal atmosphere, but rather despicable in the fresh air outside the courts. The question of the ecclesiastical commission was, however, a constitutional as well as a legal question, and as such it was bound to attract more of the attention of the general public. The right to fine was not so seriously at issue, for a consultation of civil judges and councillors in 1577 had declared the competence of the court to fine recusants; but the right to imprison and the determination of the question in what cases these penalties might or might not be inflicted—these formed the kernel of dispute.

In May 1606 the civil judges returned a somewhat captious and scornful answer to the Council concerning these *Articles*. They were irritated by the tone of the complaint as well as by the charges that it contained. Coke, who ^{The reply of the judges.} had recently become chief justice of the Common Pleas, was a man much swayed by his prejudices, and of more learning than judgment. He had shown himself increasingly to be the opponent of the royal prerogative, just as his great rival Bacon had shown himself its advocate; his weight, therefore, and learning were now thrown on the side of opposition to the archbishop's articles and to the claims of the commissioners. The answer acknowledged the multitude of prohibitions; the best it could say in defence was that so far during the king's reign only 251 had been granted from the King's Bench and 62 from the Common Pleas. The judges stood stiffly on their ground, giving little reply to the charges, and protesting that it would need an act of parliament to dislodge them. As to the two points raised about the ecclesiastical commission, they said they should continue to grant a prohibition in cases where the commissioners had gone

beyond their powers in imprisoning, or had misused the oath *ex officio*.

Parliament and convocation were sitting at that time ; and, while convocation petitioned against the prohibitions, parliament raised again amongst its petitions for ecclesi-

Intervention
of parliament
and convoca-
tion.

astical reform the question of the oath *ex officio*. A

fresh inquiry was made thereupon by the Council and replied to by Coke and Popham in a contrary

sense to the decision recently given, requiring the ordinary both to show the questions before administering them, and to forbear examining laymen at all upon oath except in matrimonial and testamentary causes. A further blow was dealt at the ecclesiastical administration later on in the year, when a less formal decision was reached on the vexed question of the right of the ecclesiastical commission to imprison. This power had from the first been both exercised and questioned ; the claim rested on the letters-patent, but the civil lawyers maintained that these went beyond the act under which they were issued. They declared that as no ecclesiastical court could imprison, except in cases where such power had been expressly granted to it by act of parliament, *e.g.* in cases of heresy and schism ; so neither could the ecclesiastical commission. This was a blow at its mixed character. The court was not prepared to surrender thus an authority which it had exercised for over sixty years, ever since its establishment. This argument of the civilians was not new ; prohibitions had been based upon it from early days of the conflict ; but the custom had survived them, and the commissioners were no less determined to act upon it now than formerly, especially as the king had promised convocation that he would put a restraint upon prohibitions.

In the following summer Coke took advantage of two other opportunities of clipping the wings of the commission.

Further
hostility of
Coke to the
ecclesiastical
commission.

When Sir Anthony Roper quarrelled with his parson about tithes, the court denied the competence of the commissioners to hear the case or to order

payment, and released Roper from the Fleet when they committed him. Again, in the case of another clerical squabble, the court prohibited the suit before the commissioners on the ground that it was not sufficiently "enormous" to come under their jurisdiction.

But the greatest stir was caused by the case of Nicholas Fuller, one of the leaders of the Puritans in the House of Commons, and their chief advocate in the courts. He had taken up the cause of two men who had been imprisoned by the Commission for refusing to take the oath *ex officio* without first seeing the interrogatories to which they were to answer. The earlier case of the two was that of Ladd, who was brought before the commission on an accusation of perjury, committed during proceedings against him in the Chancellor's court on a charge of having taken part in a conventicle. The commissioners sent him to the White Lion prison at the end of March, but Fuller procured a writ of *habeas corpus* from the Court of Common Pleas to release him. When the case came up on May 6, he argued vehemently against the Commission, that it had no right at all to fine, imprison, or administer the oath *ex officio*. He urged first that such things were popish, dating only from the act 2 Hen. IV. c. 15, and were now inconsistent with justice; and further, he denied that such powers, even though expressed in the patent of the Commission, could be legal, since they were not warranted by the Act of Supremacy under which the commission was constituted. Such arguments as these were not unwelcome at Westminster, though they went further than the civil judges were prepared to go. At Lambeth, however, they were considered to be not only an unwarrantable attack on the court, but "schism and erroneous opinions."

The case of
Nicholas
Fuller.

His argument
against the
commission.

Before the day came for Fuller's argument on behalf of his clients, he was haled before the Commission, fined £200, and sent to prison, protesting that the commissioners were not competent either to act as interpreters of an act of parliament or as judges in a dispute as to their jurisdiction. Fuller then obtained a prohibition on his own account from the King's Bench; the cause of his client fell into the background, and the judges assembled to decide the points raised by his treatment at the commissioners' hands. They held that it lay with the civil not the ecclesiastical judges to interpret the act of parliament and its relation to the letters-patent of the Commission, and to determine the limits of the competence of the

When it laid
hold of him
and punished
him he
obtained a
prohibition.

ecclesiastical courts; that with regard to Fuller's attack on the Commission, he was answerable for any contempt of court only to a civil court, but to ecclesiastical judges for any "heresy, schism, or erroneous opinion" in religion. This was the nature of the charge brought against Fuller—therefore the commissioners were upheld in their sentence of fine and imprisonment; but for the rest Fuller's argument was to a large extent endorsed by the judges, and the claims of the ecclesiastical commission disallowed.

The case caused much excitement. At the beginning of September, when Fuller had procured his prohibition, the king took up the matter and urged the archbishop to persevere in his conflict. When the judges' award was given, though Fuller's sentence to fine and imprisonment was upheld, the ecclesiastics had plenty to discontent them: and Bancroft appealed to the king to arbitrate in their favour, urging that he, as the fountain of all justice, should decide personally between the rival claims of the two systems. The king responded, and took up the defence of the ecclesiastical court; but he was prevented from giving a decision in its favour, for at a conference early in November the judges unanimously assured him that he had no such power, as the archbishop had suggested, to determine cases in person. The decision against the claims of the commission therefore stood. On the other hand, Fuller got no relief, but remained in the Fleet. At the end of the year he paid his fine, but he was in prison some days longer until he consented to make an ample submission.

It was evident that no settlement was yet reached. The next year passed in further legal dissensions. The Councils of the North, of Wales, and of the County Palatine of Chester had many complaints of their own against the aggressiveness of the courts of Westminster, and on these too the king and the privy council had to adjudicate. The ecclesiastical courts were being restricted by technical hindrances, such as the argument that the Court of Arches, being held in Bow Church, Cheapside, a peculiar of Canterbury, was not in the diocese of London, and therefore could not cite a man living in that diocese. Greater decisions also went against them, as when the judges of Common Pleas

The king
succours the
ecclesiastics.

Skirmishing
continues.

struck another blow at the mixed character of the Commission, and pushed on their decision against its power to imprison one point further, by deciding that it had no power to arrest by a pursuivant like a civil court, but only to proceed by citation as an ecclesiastical court. Then a fresh point arose.

When the canonists had been defiant, the civilians had muttered threats about the *præmunire*; so, in order to disarm them of this weapon, the canonists took up again an old argument of Dr. Cosin, dating back to the earlier defence of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction against the Erastian arguments of the Puritans, viz. that since the Crown has now the supreme authority over all ecclesiastical law, no *præmunire* lies any longer against any ecclesiastical judge. This doctrine was revived in 1607 by Dr. Ridley in his *View of Civil and Ecclesiastical Law*, and pressed even further by Dr. Cowell in his *Interpreter* in order to prove that all prohibitions might be abolished; but it was repudiated by the judges. They had already met the argument in Bancroft's *Articles of Abuses*, and they now laid down three rules to govern the cases in which the ecclesiastical judge might incur a *præmunire*—thus still holding the penalty *in terrorem* over him.

The fight thus grew hotter and hotter: the ecclesiastical lawyers petitioned the archbishop, enlisted the universities on their side, and, in January 1609, appealed to the king, who had recently, in November, been busy holding several conferences with the judges in order to restrain their interference with the ecclesiastical commission and the courts of York and Wales, and seeking at the same time to magnify his own prerogative. In February there was an unseemly scene in the Council chamber when the question was solemnly discussed: the king and Coke nearly came to blows, and the conflict was postponed. When it came up again in July, the occasion was a technical dispute as to the adjudication of quarrels about local customs with regard to tithes; but on this the whole fundamental question was raised, both as to the chief points at issue between the civil and ecclesiastical courts and also as to the right method of deciding such controversies. The archbishop and the judge of his Prerogative Court put the case of the ecclesiastical judges, and Bacon, as solicitor-general, spoke on the same

The dispute
as to
præmunire.

Repeated
disputes at
the Council.

side. The three judges present with Coke at their head protested at being put to argue instead of to adjudicate, and to plead, moreover, against their inferiors; but they delivered their opinion at considerable length, and the discussion went on for three days.

In the end James characteristically both took upon himself to adjudicate and then came to no decision: he contented himself with generalities, perhaps because it was really clear that on the particular point at issue the civilians had made out their case; but he warned them against encroaching upon the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. As to the question of the ecclesiastical commissions, however, he was willing to make some changes, viz. to reduce them to two, one for each province, and to restrict them to offences of exceptional enormity.

The king
temporises.

A peace so hollow could hardly prove lasting; but this represents the furthest point reached by Bancroft. These quarrels had been the principal disturbances of his later years. In his ecclesiastical administration he had wonderfully succeeded in conciliating the Puritans; his chief difficulties were with the Recusants, especially in the north and west, where justice was paralysed by the dispute between the councils and the judges at Westminster. The judges of assize complicated the dealings by administering a less strict form of oath than that prescribed—an unusual sign of mercy on their part; while the Recusants invented new ways of evading the interrogatories, and the king's policy alternated between severity and laxity. A few Brownists were occasionally found and their conventicle broken up. But, on the whole, comparative peace reigned in the administration of the dioceses, and in the long interval of nearly three years, from July 4, 1607, to February 9, 1610, when James attempted to do without a parliament, another cause of difficulty was for a time in abeyance. It was only too clear, however, that, when parliament was again summoned, the false peace would soon come to an end.

Bancroft's
better success
in other
spheres.

When the Houses assembled, early in 1610, the chief part of the efforts of the Commons was devoted to the conflict with the Crown on financial grounds. The disagreements

which had manifested themselves at the beginning of the reign in this sphere had now grown to the magnitude of a great constitutional struggle. They had not been buried in the interval since the parliament was last prorogued. On reassembling, the House, however desirous to arrive at a better understanding with the Crown, was soon forced into a position of hostility. From this it could not recede, while the king on his part would not recede; and so the conflict between the king's waning defence of the royal prerogative and the parliament's growing claim for constitutional government went on in its course towards the fatal issue of the Rebellion.

The parliament of 1610,
February 9
to July 23.

There was room, however, in the thick of the conflict for some attention to be given to ecclesiastical affairs; indeed, it is perhaps truer to say that ecclesiastical affairs henceforward ceased to stand by themselves or to be judged on their merits, but were absorbed more and more into the general conflict, as the alliance grew closer between the king and the Church on the one side and the Commons and puritanism on the other. Two of the many petitions submitted to the Crown included ecclesiastical grievances. The earlier began with a complaint of the leniency exhibited towards the Recusants; to this the king weakly agreed to defer, influenced no doubt by the general alarm occasioned by the murder of Henry IV. of France, and by the exultation of Roman Catholics abroad at the occurrence. It then went on to propose, among other things, that the deprived ministers who were orderly and willing to make the subscription demanded by act of parliament, as distinct from that demanded by Canon, should have licenses from the bishops to instruct and preach. This the king refused, citing the council and judges as being also of his mind, as well as the bishops. The Commons then, as usual, fell back on abortive attempts to secure their desire by legislation.

Ecclesiastical
troubles re-
appear in an
early

Later on, in July, ecclesiastical matters were again to the front. The Commons attacked the canons at a conference between the two Houses, and, receiving a somewhat crushing reply from the archbishop and the bishop of London, went back to incorporate their complaints against the ecclesiastical commission in a very detailed

and in a
later stage.

form in their monster petition of grievances of July 7. The king reserved his reply on the ecclesiastical question to the end of the session, and then delivered himself at length on the subject not only of the Commission but also of the four earlier grievances. He held out hopes of dealing generously with those of the deprived who were likely to conform; he showed a willingness to take up complaints of episcopal negligence, and replied to the complaints of the Commons about the abuse of excommunication by reminding them that parliament itself alone was to blame, because it had not passed a bill introduced by the clergy to remedy it. In the matter of the ecclesiastical commission he was also conciliatory, and promised that in the future the terms of the commission should be altered so as to exclude some of the points disliked. But the parliament's interest in such matters was dictated rather by a wish for grievances than a wish for remedies, and it was not to be hoped that these concessions would much ameliorate matters.

Bancroft had employed himself during the session in attempts to meet the objection, which was reasonably felt, to the great prevalence of pluralities, by making better provision for impoverished benefices. When these had proved fruitless, he wrote at the king's direction, according to his promise made to parliament, to secure the strict enforcement of the new canons which ordered pluralists to make spiritual provision for each of their cures. Together with these orders were combined others of various kinds, some for stricter dealings with recusants, others for due supervision of episcopal officials, for moderating the excesses of the clergy and their wives in the matter of their dress, for inoculating every parish with Jewel's theology, and so forth.

This mandate was the last important act of Bancroft, for in the one remaining scene of his primacy that remains to be recorded he himself took no part. This was the consecration of three bishops for Scotland. Ever since the establishment of presbyterianism by the Scottish parliament of 1592 and the consequent obscuration of the titular bishops, James had been working for their restoration. In 1600 he had appointed three fresh titular bishops. No sooner was he seated on the English throne

Bancroft's
labour at
reforms.

The Scottish
consecrations.

than he went further: he appointed the historian Spottiswoode to succeed Beaton in the see of Glasgow—a titular archbishop to succeed an archbishop of Roman appointment who had recently died in exile; and from this point he went forward, carrying out his cherished wishes with a high hand and by sole and arbitrary power. Andrew Melville, the champion of presbyterianism, was summoned to England with some of the titulars and others to confer with the king and the English bishops on episcopacy; and while the rest were amenable, he was obdurate. After a tussle with Bancroft he was sent to custody for his obduracy and for a scornful epigram on the king's chapel. The matter then went faster step by step onwards until Spottiswoode and two others came to London to receive consecration. To prevent the possibility of any misconception that Scotland was being brought under English jurisdiction neither primate took part in the ceremony; but the three titulars received their episcopal order from the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester and Worcester, in the chapel of London House, on October 21, 1610. The prelates returned home and consecrated the rest of the titulars. The king's fiat had so far carried out his darling project; but the method was arbitrary, the men were unequal to the task, the action was universally unpopular. The Scots remained at heart presbyterian, and the episcopal government only maintained a precarious existence by leaning upon the bruised staff of a tottering royal prerogative.

AUTHORITIES.—For Andrewes see Church's Essay on him in *Masters in English Theology*; Otley, *Lancelot Andrewes*; and his *Works* in the Anglo-Cath. Libr. The judgment as to Andrewes' suitability for controversy is from *S.P. Dom.* xxxvii. 25. For Donne see Jessopp, *John Donne*, and his *Works*, ed. by Alford. For the Chelsea College see Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*. For the inefficiency of the seminaries see *S.P. Dom.* xxxvi. 8. For the ecclesiastical system of law see Hale, *Precedents* (pref.); Mockett, *Doctrina et Politia*. The *Articles of Abuses* are in *Doc. Ann.*

The quarrel about prohibitions is found in Coke, *Reports*, esp. xii., xiii.; *Inst.* ii. and iv.; Brit. Mus. MSS. Cleop. F. i. and F. ii.; Faustina, D. vi.; Lansd. 160. For the decision of 1577 see Strype, *Grindal*, 232.

For Fuller see also *The Argument of M. Nich. Fuller* (1607); Lansd. MS. 1172; *S.P. Dom.* xxviii. 37, 51, 94, 128; xxxi. 2. For the king's debate with the judges in Nov. 1608, Harl. MS. 160, f. 425; *S.P. Dom.* xxxvii. 53.

For the Parliamentary petitions of 1610 see Prothero; *S.P. Dom.* liii.-lvi. For the Scottish consecrations see Stephen, *History of the Scottish Church*.

CHAPTER XXI

THE DAYS OF ABBOT

IN nominating a successor to Bancroft the king had a difficult task. The late archbishop had belied his early reputation,

Archbishop
Abbot
(1562-1633);
succeeds,
1610;

and wrought peace and conciliation through a policy which combined firmness with gentleness. If it was the latter quality which was chiefly to be desired in his successor, there was no question that Andrewes had unrivalled claims to the succession: many looked to him as the chief influence of the day, and supposed unhesitatingly that the king's choice would fall on him. It fell, however, upon a much smaller man, George Abbot, recently consecrated Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and almost at once translated to London. Abbot had been the leader of the Calvinists at Oxford, where he had done his ineffective best to suppress the rising school of more liberal theology, and its leader William Laud, fellow of St. John's College. He had lent himself eagerly to James's projects for the introduction of episcopacy into Scotland; as chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar, the Scottish treasurer, he had done yeoman service in reconciling the Scots to the idea, for his own view of the position of bishops was superficial, and his underlying beliefs were identical with those of the mislikers of episcopacy. He had finally presided at the consecration of the three Scottish bishops.

James, having thus used him to anglicise Scotland, now desired to use him again in scotticising England. Bancroft, the preacher of the sermon at Paul's Cross (p. 275), had held too exalted views. Andrewes, if he succeeded him, would

be worse still. James wanted an archbishop who would accept the office rather as an appointment from the Crown than as a necessary function of the Church. ^{his qualifications and disqualifications.} "Divine right" belonged to kings, and he mistrusted any bishop who wished to make the same claim for his order. Abbot accepted the king's view, and in the days of his misfortune it recoiled upon him. The consequences to him personally were, however, the least part of the disasters that followed his appointment. The consequences to the Church were more fatal, for not only was it the death-blow to the growing mutual trust that Bancroft had fostered between the rival parties in the Church, but the liberal and catholic-minded party had to wait twenty-three long years before it had a chance of taking up Bancroft's work. Then the opportunity came too late: the breach had widened again, and become too wide to be bridged. Both the upholders and the opponents of the constitution of the Church, as laid down in its canons, prayer-book, and ecclesiastical system in general, had alike stiffened and closed their ranks for war; and the policy of Laud and coercion could only vindicate the true character of the Church of England by bitter conflict, and win its triumph through an apparently crushing defeat.

The difficulties that beset the Church called for a more skilful hand and a wider outlook than Abbot could command. As they closed in upon him the new primate was soon in trouble. In spite of his views the Puritans ^{The attitude of the Puritans towards him.} disliked and mistrusted him; from the first they had feared his nomination to the see, since a rumour was current that Abbot had been recommended as his successor to the king by Bancroft on his deathbed. Their fears were realised, though the rumour that raised them was soon forgotten; for the king explained frankly that the recommendation which had weighed with him in making the nomination came from the Earl of Dunbar, and it was evident that the choice was all of a piece with the king's Scottish policy. At once the issue of puritan controversial literature began again, and a cry arose for more puritan lawyers to second Fuller in meeting a recrudescence of prelatical intolerance.

The legal quarrels had begun again even before the king had decided upon the new archbishop, and very soon after

his confirmation in his see, which took place on April 9, he was in the thick of the conflict. The present occasion arose out of two prohibitions granted by Coke in the Court of Common Pleas. One concerned the case of a man who was convented by the ecclesiastical courts for saying that the bishops and the government of the Church of England were Antichrist, that the prayer-book was not authorised by law, and so forth. The other was a case of a marriage scandal with which the Commission had dealt drastically. The king was very angry with Coke for "the perverseness of his spirit" in issuing these prohibitions, and the more so that, on being interrogated, he quibbled about them. Three weeks later, on March 19, 1611, a fresh case arose. The commissioners sent Sir William Chancy to the Fleet for adultery and refusal to support his wife. He obtained release on bail from the Common Pleas, on the ground that the Commission had no right to imprison for such an offence, although it was acknowledged that they had done so for twenty years.

Here Abbot intervened, took up the case and appealed to the council. In consequence a conference was held on May

Intervention
of the
primate.

23, between nine of the council, seven ecclesiastics—both prelates and lawyers—and nine judges, and the whole question of the relation of the civil to the ecclesiastical courts was reopened. Dr. Martin stated the grievance of the canonists from the lawyer's point of view, asserting especially that the ecclesiastical commission had authority independent of and antecedent to the Supremacy Act of Elizabeth. In this way he struck at the claim of the civil courts to define the limits of its authority by reference to that act. When Coke in his reply denied this, the new archbishop narrowed down the issue to the single question of the right of the court to fine and imprison, citing especially three typical cases of prohibitions wrongly granted, the first concerning the value of a benefice, the second concerning the procedure by oath *ex officio*, and the third concerning the imprisonment of Chancy. So the debate went on under the presidency of the lord chancellor, who inclined to the side of the ecclesiastical party. Coke had already submitted a treatise on the powers of the Commission, especially in the matter

of fine and imprisonment ; it embodied the recent resolutions of the Court of Common Pleas, which set narrow limits to the powers of the Commission in these respects ; but the present discussion eventually covered a wider field. The council was still unconvinced by Coke and his colleagues. At subsequent meetings the attempt was made on the part of the Crown to induce other judges to take the opposite line and support the right of the ecclesiastical commission to fine and imprison at will. The King's Bench, however, agreed with the Common Pleas. Finally, at a meeting of the king, the council, the judges of the King's Bench, and the barons of the Exchequer, to which Coke and his fellows were summoned, but from which they were at once excluded, some difference of opinion was elicited ; and the king made this the excuse for summoning and lecturing the other judges, and the occasion for renewing his promises that in the new commission soon to be issued material changes should be made.

These promises, like many others of the king, were not fulfilled. The new letters-patent, dated August 29, were drawn up with the advice of the judges of the King's Bench ; but those of the Common Pleas had no knowledge of the contents of the patent till they were summoned to hear the commission read at Lambeth. They found that their names were included among the commissioners, but they cautiously refused to take their seats until they had heard the document. After it had been read, they still refused, on the ground that it contained divers points against the laws and statutes of England. In fact, of nine demands for change that had been formulated, none were taken into account. The commission regranted power not only to wield ecclesiastical censures, but to inflict fine and imprisonment, without restriction to particular causes, to attach by pursuivant as well as to summon by citation, to exact the oath *ex officio* as before, and to imprison refusers. In some respects, indeed, there were changes ; the trial by jury was dropped, the quality of offence cognisable was more clearly defined, the power to give definitive sentence was reserved to a quorum of five, and some provision was made for an appeal to the Crown for a commission of review. But, on the whole, the position was little altered, and Coke with his companions

The king's
promises un-
fulfilled.

maintained their attitude of protest. The stream of opposition then turned into a new channel, and the attempt was made to prevent the granting of prohibitions by the Court of Common Pleas; but on this point the King's Bench and Exchequer entirely supported the sister court, and convinced the lord chancellor that its rights in this respect were unquestionable.

The contest
continues on
new ground.

The new Commission at once tried its hand on some heresy questions; they were broached while Coke was still holding back from taking his seat at the board, and they did not end until they had issued in two barbarous executions. Curiously enough, in these matters Coke was found jealous for the authority of the ecclesiastical commission and denying that heretics could lawfully be burnt upon conviction in any less court. His opinion, however, was overruled, and both Legate and Wightman were brought before the consistory court of the diocese. The former was a man of some distinction, and had been admitted to the court to gratify the king's love of controversy; but he remained stiff in his Arian opinions, and even when released from Newgate he was still defiant. Wightman, on the other hand, was a poor crazy soul whose ignorance deserved nothing but gentle dealing.

Processes for
heresy

But James had recently been posing as a champion of orthodoxy against a heterodox German, Vorstius by name, who, to the king's great horror, had been made divinity professor at Leyden, in the midst of his Dutch allies. The need was felt of some demonstration at home in order to heighten the picture of James posing as defender of the faith; these two men seemed suitable victims, and their tenets could be made out to be sufficiently like those of the anabaptists of the last reign, or of Francis Ket who was burnt for heresy in 1588, to warrant the rekindling of the fires which the previous century had thought to be the due penalty of such heretical views. So the legal objections were cautiously evaded by the archbishop's diplomacy; the antiquated writ *de heretico comburendo* proceeded forth for the last time from the chancery; Legate was burnt at Smithfield on March 18, 1612, and Wightman at Lichfield on the succeeding April 11. The time had not come when such

result in
executions.

executions evoked any horror: to contemporaries it seemed condign punishment. But it is a sign of the gradual growth of toleration in matters of religious belief that, when next such treatment came into question, public opinion had so far grown as to prevent any further repetition of it, and in 1618 the king reprieved a Portuguese ex-monk who, on a charge of blasphemy, had been handed over to the sheriffs to be burnt.

After this troublous opening of the new primacy the Church settled down to what was, outwardly at least, the most uneventful decade of the period covered by this volume.

The archbishop himself was never popular: he never won the confidence of the clergy, and to the end they looked upon him as a man who was out of touch with normal church work, for want of having had any parochial experience himself. He was also out of sympathy with the real power of the church life of the day as represented by Andrewes and his school; and though the gentle bishop was personally friendly with him, it was far otherwise with William Laud, the man who was to take up Andrewes' work and carry it out into practice by energetic means. Between him and the archbishop there was little in common from the day forward when Laud, as a young fellow of St. John's, began to head a party in Oxford of revolt against the dominant Calvinism of which Abbot, as Master of University College, was the chief leader.

Abbot
unpopular,

By the side of the exponents of the new broad-minded and more catholic theology Abbot seemed hard and narrow; compared with those who exemplified the warmth

of the new piety he was cold; and though his fidelity to his principles was sometimes set off by the failure of others, even his most virtuous actions

even when
on the right
side, as in the
Essex case.

failed to commend themselves to the hearts of his people. The most striking instance of this was the famous Essex divorce suit. The Countess sought by most shameless means to obtain a divorce from the Earl of Essex, and her strong character fascinated not only the court but some of the bishops and lawyers to whom the investigation of the cause was committed. In the end she obtained her sentence, on September 25, 1613; four of the bishops, including Andrewes, were in favour of granting the divorce on the ground of nullity in the marriage, while

the archbishop, with Bishop King of London and three of the lawyers, stood firm on the other side. Abbot had to bear the brunt of the attack made upon their righteous action. The events soon justified them. The quondam countess speedily entered upon a shameless alliance with her guilty lover Robert Carr, the king's new Scottish favourite, recently created Earl of Somerset, and it gradually became known that, to facilitate this result, she had not scrupled to procure the imprisonment and murder of his rival Sir Thomas Overbury. Such a scandal did much to establish Abbot's righteousness; but his popularity did not grow.

Among the evil results to the Church that sprang from Abbot's ineffectiveness, none was more far-reaching than the fact that it was thrown all the more into the arms of the king. If interest in theological disputation were the best requirement for a nursing father for the Church, James might have ranked high. Unfortunately other qualities are of more importance in a ruler who is to influence ecclesiastical affairs aright; and these James conspicuously lacked. He had the Tudor wish to rule autocratically without the Tudor faculty for carrying his people with him. On the contrary, his intervention was increasingly an object of suspicion; and as he intervened continually, and especially in the conflicts between ecclesiastical and secular interests, on the side of the Church, he made it share the suspicion and unpopularity which more and more gathered round his actions.

Thus when the king and the archbishop made an attack on puritanism it was certain that sympathy would be evoked for those who were attacked. At the beginning of the new primacy Abbot was busy in conjunction with the Bishop of Peterborough in dealing with the troublesome county of Northamptonshire. But suspensions were ineffective, for the suspended ministers continued to preach, and the more they were repressed the more popular they became. As time went on, the opposition to the policy of the king and archbishop found a new focus, for the puritan party tended to rally round Henry, Prince of Wales, and he to place his talents and popularity openly at their service. His death, on November 6, 1612,

Suspicion
grows round
the king's
policy.

Puritanism
profits by the
want of con-
fidence in
king or
primate.

was a great blow to their hopes. Almost immediately his chaplain, Lewis Baily, subsequently Bishop of Bangor and author of the popular devotional manual *The Practice of Piety*, preached on the decay of religion owing to popish leanings in high places. In his sermon he quoted the prince as having said shortly before his decease that "religion lay a-bleeding, and no marvail when divers of the privy council hear mass in the morning, court sermon in the afternoon, tell their wives what is done at the Council so that they tell their Jesuits and confessors." This attack, which was aimed not only against recusants like Northampton, but also at suspects like Suffolk, was much taken up by the Puritans; Baily was summoned for it before the archbishop and before the council, but he came away unscathed, to the great delight of his admirers.

While the cause of puritanism was becoming increasingly identified with the popular suspicion of the king and his policy, the cause of recusancy was in a more dubious position. The king's attitude to the recusant problem was constantly shifting. If he had been consistent and firm, his own leanings towards toleration would have made him gentle; but every move that he made in that direction only roused fresh suspicion in the breasts of his people; and periods of laxness in the administration of the penal laws were followed by periods of comparative strictness. James's own instability was aggravated by his circumstances; political exigencies dictated to him a shifting policy with regard to the imprisonment or execution of recusants, while financial considerations and the clamorous needs of his favourites forced him at constant intervals to call for the exaction of the recusant fines.

Recusancy's
varying
fortunes.

The year 1612 was especially a fatal one for the Romanists. A fresh attack upon the oath of allegiance at Rome led to fresh insistence upon it in England; the prisons were again crammed, and four men—three priests and one layman—were hanged. Blackfan, the new archpriest, was apprehended on his way to the Spanish ambassador's house, and the old flames of complaint against Spanish masses broke out afresh. Priests were released from prison and deported, often as a concession or favour to some distinguished foreigner, but they returned to court a worse

Renewal of
persecution;

fate. The stricter execution of the law filled the existing prisons, and it became necessary to prepare new places of confinement. The circumstances of prison life varied as hitherto between comparative comfort and extreme discomfort. The Gatehouse had an evil reputation for cruelty. The keeper was said to have immured one prisoner in the lowest dungeon, chained head to foot, and left without food, fire, or bed for three days, on account of a small debt. When another complained of the badness of the food, for which the keeper was well paid, he was met only with a threat that he should be made to eat his own mattress. At Wisbeach, on the contrary, the traditions were different, and the gentle influence of Andrewes made itself felt, for the castle was one of his official residences as Bishop of Ely. When stringent orders for the custody of the priests imprisoned there came down from the Council in 1615, the bishop obtained better terms for them. He recovered for them their breviaries and the liberty to see their friends, because he would not "add affliction to the afflicted," only stipulating that they should not turn his chapel into a cellar, as their predecessors had done. Determined efforts were made to reconcile them to the English Church with but varying success.

But the recrudescence of persecution was no more a popular move on the part of the government than the attempt at toleration had been. On the contrary, it evoked serious resentment. It became necessary to take precautions against assemblies of recusants and to obviate a threatened attempt at a rescue when Latham was executed at Tyburn in December 1612.

Controversy of a literary kind continued unabated, but it was not marked by any special feature except the growth of the Nag's Head Fable (p. 47). Invented by Hollywood in 1604, it acquired its first vogue through the writings of Fitzsimmons and Champneys in the second decade of the century. It was at once refuted by the defenders of the English Church, headed by Francis Mason, but it dies hard. In the course of the fighting some captives were taken by either side, and when the king lost one of his chaplains by the defection of Carrier he gained another by the capture of Richard Sheldon. Some

but a reaction
ensues.

The literary
controversy.

priests made more than one change, and, like Theophilus Higgons or Leonard Rowntree, only left the Church of England to return to it again.

Meanwhile the dissensions continued among the Roman Catholics themselves. Even after the death of Parsons in 1610 the quarrel between Jesuits and Seculars survived, and the struggle of the latter to get free from the control of the society went on unceasingly. ^{Internal dissensions of the Recusants.} Their emancipation came about only gradually. The first sign of their success was seen in the appointment of a bishop to exercise authority in England, according to the desire long expressed by the Seculars and long resisted by the Jesuits. In 1623, William Bishop, an old champion of the Seculars, was appointed titular Bishop of Chalcedon, with authority over the Roman Catholics in England. The king was favourably disposed to this innovation. Bishop had signed the protestation of loyalty drawn up as Elizabeth lay dying, and when the Jesuits schemed to prevail upon the king to resist his appointment, this only made him more anxious to facilitate it. Bishop's episcopal career was brief, for he was consecrated in Paris on June 4, 1623, and died in the following April; but it was long enough to give considerable encouragement to the Recusants and to rouse corresponding alarm in parliament and in the country generally.

The suspicion with which the Church was regarded through its alliance with the Crown was especially enhanced by the unfortunate quarrels of the king with parliament.

Ecclesiastical matters formed only a part of the ques- ^{The breach between king and parliament:} tions at issue between them, and a group of secular points circling round the constitutional relation of

Crown and parliament was by far the largest part of them; but even so the Church suffered from being identified with the king's side of the quarrel. This was the more inevitable, inasmuch as the broader and more catholic conception of the Church did not find favour with the politicians. Puritanism increased its hold upon the members of the House of Commons, and their religious views were indistinguishably bound up with their political views.

James had been more or less at variance with his first parliament during the whole of its lifetime, and at its dissolu-

tion, on February 9, 1611, not only was the quarrel acute, but the part in it played by ecclesiastical affairs was considerable. When a fresh parliament met, ^{its origin, and progress in 1614.} on April 3, 1614, in spite of all the efforts that the government had made to secure the return of its own supporters to the Lower House, it was a new and a hostile body with which the king, his ministers, and the bishops were confronted. The constituencies had insisted in choosing of their own free will, and on sending up men who would defend the rights and liberties of the people against the arbitrary methods of the royal prerogative or the discredited execution of ecclesiastical law and discipline.

Their religious prejudice was soon manifested. They determined to receive communion together as a method of

excluding papists. No member who failed to communicate was to be admitted to the House. The ^{Militant puritanism in the "addled parliament."} service was first appointed for nine o'clock on Palm

Sunday at Westminster Abbey, but in the interval Wentworth raised the religious question and occupied part of his tirade with protests against crosses on communion bread. On the following day it was decided to go to St. Margaret's instead of the Abbey, "for fear of copes and wafer cakes and such other important reasons," as an onlooker scoffingly recounted. Fuller and other puritan leaders were soon busy with the usual attempts to make men religious by act of parliament, and when Neile, Bishop of Lincoln, was foolish enough to reply hotly in the House of Lords to the abusive language against the clergy, which was of common occurrence in the Commons, and to a specially insolent speech of Secretary Winwood, a fine stir was made. The assembly was "more like a cockpit than a grave council," and became involved in a most undignified quarrel with the Upper House, which was only cut short by the guillotine of dissolution when the parliament was but two months old.

More than seven years passed before James summoned a third parliament. If it showed itself more ready ^{A recrudescence of quarrelling in 1621} than its predecessor to come to terms with the Crown, it was little less swayed by religious prejudice. Foreign politics had in the interval accentuated the difficulties which beset the religious settlement,

while at home the steady growth in influence and power of the school of Andrewes had made puritanism more aggressive than ever. The same expedient was adopted by the Commons of a corporate communion as a precaution against recusancy; but the authorities at the Abbey vetoed, as ordinaries, the repetition of the service at St. Margaret's and the appointment of Usher as preacher. Williams, who was now dean, offered the Abbey, with a prebendary as preacher and common bread in place of the wafer bread; but the House refused the offer and decided to resort to the Temple Church. Williams thereupon raised a fresh protest, but through the mediation of the king the objection of the Westminster authorities was removed, and the service took place as before.

After this opening the rest of the history also repeated itself. The violence of the House against recusancy was only outdone by the fury which it displayed towards one of its members who, in a debate upon a bill for the observance of the Sabbath, presumed to defend the Maypole and other traditional amusements, and to scorn puritan sabbatarianism as being alien to the proper Christian view of Sunday. He himself was forced to an abject apology; but his words had at any rate the effect of causing "the Lord's Day" to be substituted for "the Sabbath" in the title of the bill. From June 4 to November 20 the parliament stood adjourned; its ecclesiastical temper underwent no change in the interval. Hatred of Spain and savage prejudice against recusants filled many speeches, and political considerations inflamed religious prejudice, while both deepened the quarrel between parliament and king and hastened a fresh dissolution.

Of late a fresh difference had grown up with regard to the king's foreign policy. The divergence of parties consequent upon the reformation was conspicuous enough in England, but it was far more conspicuous abroad. The whole of western Europe was divided into two camps by the religious question. In some part or another of the field war had been going on continuously, and religious opinions had no small share in maintaining it. It was inevitable that England should be called upon to take a side in this rivalry. All Elizabeth's diplomacy had not

leads to fresh quarrels and a dissolution.

The same divergence in foreign policy.

succeeded in keeping her reign clear of such entanglements, and in James's case the matrimonial alliances of his children became a fruitful source of international trouble.

When the question arose in 1612 of the marriage of the king's elder daughter, the Lady Elizabeth, Abbot took great pains to secure her betrothal to the Lutheran
The alliance with the Elector Palatine. Elector Palatine Frederick instead of to Philip III. of Spain. When he succeeded, he seemed to have done a good deed for the security of English protestantism; but the consequences were not all beneficial. The marriage was popular in the country, and parliament favoured Frederick when he posed as the champion of protestantism. But trouble followed when in 1619 he accepted the crown of Bohemia, and it gradually led up to the Thirty Years' War. England was thus involved in the European disputes, and while parliament favoured Frederick and was eager to support him by money and arms, James was found to hold back and to hanker after an alliance with Spain. This divergence of opinion on foreign policy naturally affected home affairs also; for alliance with Frederick meant an aggressively protestant line in internal matters, just as an alliance with Spain involved a line of toleration towards the Recusants.

So the breach was widened between king and parliament, and the policy which Abbot had forwarded involved the Church once again in the unpopularity of the king.
Abbot powerless to mend matters. A capable archbishop might have done much to obviate these evil consequences and even to heal the breach, but Abbot was uninfluential and incapable. He had indeed protested against the king's reluctance to call a parliament: so far, therefore, he was qualified to act as mediator; but he was unequal to the position and had placed himself fatally in the hands of the king. Moreover, in the summer of 1621 a misfortune befell him which reduced his influence still lower. He had the misfortune, while shooting in Lord Zouch's park at Bramshill, to kill a keeper. By this accidental homicide he was held to be disabled from exercising spiritual functions, and the consecration of Williams, Laud, and others in the winter was performed without him. His case was examined by a body of commissioners, who varied greatly in their judgment upon it; eventually he was restored by a commission of eight

bishops to the exercise of all his functions, but the incident cast a shadow over the remainder of his career.

The differences between king and parliament which he had been unable to alleviate had long been aggravated by the plans for another marriage in the royal family. Prince Charles had at first been destined for a French princess; but after his creation as Prince of Wales in 1616 it became evident that the idea of a Spanish match was superseding the negotiations with France, and a formal proposal was made for the hand of the Infanta Maria in 1617. Immediately the results followed that recusancy lifted its head more proudly, and protestantism protested more passionately. The plan was taken up warmly by George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the king's new and all-powerful favourite, and adroitly forwarded by Gondomar, the able Spanish ambassador. He thought that he saw in it a means whereby toleration, or even a free exercise of their religion, might be obtained for the Recusants.

The project
of the
Spanish
match

But the national feeling was too strong, and the chorus of protest was too loud and too general. For a time, in deference to it, the project was dismissed into the background, and Gondomar returned to Spain to mature his plans there. The immediate outcome of the broaching of such a scheme had so far been this, to strengthen in some quarters the hatred of recusancy and Spain, but in others to develop a fresh sense of toleration, till people began to look forward to the day when "there might be a protestant priest at one end of the church and a papist at the other." Even when the project fell into the background the excitement did not cease. It was of no avail that the king ordered the clergy not to preach against the Spanish match, or promised the new parliament of 1621 that such a union should not lead to any toleration of popery. Gondomar had recently returned to England, and the project was known to be revived. The king was refusing the desire of the nation to go to war on behalf of his son-in-law and in defence of the Lutherans against the Catholics; and presently the visit of Prince Charles and Buckingham to Spain made it evident that the hated Spanish match was drawing nearer and nearer.

provokes
fresh
opposition.

James hoped that a personal visit might accomplish success-

fully that settlement of terms between Spain and England which had so far baffled all diplomatic efforts. Much haggling ensued between the two courts with considerable intervention from Rome: not only were the personal arrangements for the Infanta discussed, but also the concessions to be made to the English recusants. King and prince alike made reckless promises, holding out hopes of an immediate suspension and a speedy repeal of the penal laws against them. The marriage contract was actually signed, but the death of Pope Paul V. gave pause to the negotiations. Thereafter they dragged on heavily. The prince returned, but the prospect steadily receded into the background, until a formal postponement of the wedding three days before it was to have taken place (November 26, 1623) brought it to a final end.

The journey
of the Prince
of Wales to
Spain.

When the new parliament of 1624 met, the headstrong dealings of the king with Spain had sealed afresh the alliance which united the religious views of extreme protestantism with the political aspirations after constitutional government in a strong confederacy against the Crown. The violence against recusancy found its vent in a new penal bill against the Recusants, and a petition to the Crown to sharpen the execution of the existing laws against them. A hasty swing of the pendulum was bringing back the plan of a French alliance. The king and the prince both pledged themselves to see that no concessions were promised towards the Recusants in any future treaty of marriage with a Roman Catholic princess; but when parliament was at an end, the king disallowed the penal act against them which it had passed, and within a few months he violated his pledge by promising religious liberty to the Recusants among the terms of a contract of marriage between Prince Charles and the French Princess Henrietta Maria. Thus recklessly were sown the seeds of much trouble to come, in which the Crown and the parliament, the cause of the Church and the cause of the Recusants, alike were to have a disastrous share.

The parliament
of 1624,
Feb. 19 to
Nov. 2.

The growth in violence of protestant sentiment which was thus fostered by political events was not without its effects on the inner economy of the Church. One sign of it is found

in the growing sabbatarianism. The Puritans, wishing to find biblical sanction for all that they approved, were led to transfer to the Christian Sunday the bulk of the Jewish orders for the observance of the Sabbath. Much conflict arose in consequence of their invasion of the liberty of men to enjoy innocent amusement on Sunday after service. At Salisbury, for example, in 1611, the Wardens of the Taylors' Company were sent to prison for patronising morris-dancers on Sunday, and were only admitted to bail after enduring a disquisition from the mayor on the subject of the profanation of the Sabbath. But the conflict came to a more violent issue in 1617. James, on his return from Scotland, found Lancashire in an uproar; and when an appeal was made to him on behalf of those who were deprived of their games, sports, and dancing on Sunday afternoon, he took their part and issued a *Declaration of Sports* securing to the people their old amusements, and commending the old customs of Maypole, morris-dancing, Whitsun-ales, rush-bearing, and the like. At the beginning of the following year, in an evil moment, he determined to make this pronouncement general by the unusual method of ordering all the clergy to read it from the pulpit on Sunday. James's intention may have been to preserve ancient liberties, but in any case his method of action was tyrannical. The order was met with signs of determined opposition, before which James quailed and gave way. The difficulties remained. Some signs of them have already been recounted in dealing with the parliament of 1621 and its sabbatarian bill. When a similar measure was submitted to the king at the close of the ensuing parliament in 1624, James refused to give his consent to it, passing it by with some banter; but the problem came up again in a more acute form in the days of his successor.

This was not the only sphere in which there was rebellion against the growing burden of puritan tyranny. Protests of parishioners against the sour discipline or aggressive nonconformity of their minister were not uncommon. Gerard Prior, Vicar of Elsfeld, not only fell short in conformity, used a forbidden catechism, declined to make the sign of the cross in baptism or to bid the Holy days, but he also defrauded the people of their Whitsuntide communion,

Sabbatarianism causes fresh difficulties.

Signs of rebellion against puritanism,

and when he celebrated a fortnight later, did so unreverently and without surplice. He hid the surplice from the churchwardens, refused to bury, encouraged people to communicate sitting, and in general provoked his parishioners to such a point that they raised a strong protest.

Another sign of the time is seen in the complaint preferred against him that his sermons "tended for the most part to death and damnation." The tide ^{and Calvinistic preaching.} was turning in some places against the extreme Calvinistic teaching, and the conforming clergy were increasingly the exponents of a more liberal theology. As the benefices fell more and more into the hands of this school, puritanism was forced to make new provision for itself by developing a system of afternoon lectureships. At these the nonconforming or suspect divine preached Calvinism in his cloak, often unlicensed and usually unfettered by any liturgical service. Such a procedure could not long escape censure, especially as, no doubt, these were also the sermons which most bitterly inveighed against the Spanish match and the prospects of toleration for recusancy. In 1622 the king issued directions concerning preachers to every diocesan, which contained special rules for these afternoon sermons, and expressed the opinion that preachers would do better to catechise than to preach. Six or seven years later it was necessary for Charles to be far more explicit in the matter, as the plan had spread until all the puritan centres were provided by this means with ministrations according to the views of the party and not according to the mind of the Church of England.

The greater part, however, of the king's directions was designed to restrain preachers from controversial topics either of politics or of divinity. The rebellion against Calvinism, which began at Cambridge, had spread throughout the country, and everywhere men were taking sides on "the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility of God's grace." The movement had now acquired the name of Arminianism, from a parallel rebellion led by Jacob Arminius, a professor at Leyden, against the extreme form of Calvinism which had fastened itself on the

The Arminian
controversy
leads to

Low Countries ever since their successful emancipation from the yoke of Spain. Only a small minority of preachers like Andrewes had sufficient reverence and restraint to avoid the popular discussion of the controverted topics; most of them rushed headlong into the fray, and the battle of the five points of Arminianism against the five points of Calvinism became all the more unseemly and disorderly.

In Holland the violence of the disputes led to the calling of a synod of protestant churches at Dordrecht, or Dort, to settle the disputes. The king sent four theologians to represent the English Church at this strange gathering, but ^{the Synod of Dort, 1619.} they found themselves out of place. They were too reasonable and learned to be able to agree to the one-sided animosity and unfairness with which the Arminians were treated there; they were unable, of course, to agree with the presbyterian position of those with whom they were associated; and thus, though they showed themselves friendly and were in return treated with marked consideration and respect, neither in doctrine nor in discipline could they comfortably mate with the rest. At their return they had to meet a strong charge of having compromised the Church of England, but they were able to rebut this charge; and when they saw the violent results which came elsewhere from the synod they may well have congratulated themselves that they found nothing worse to face.

Another step must be made over to Holland to glance at the fortunes of a small body of people who cannot be omitted from this volume, though their fortunes do not fall within the history of the English Church. At the ^{The separatist migration to America, 1620.} beginning of the reign there had gathered in a corner of Nottinghamshire the nucleus of a great development. William Brewster, after serving the queen abroad in the Low Countries, had settled down at Scrooby Manor as director of the royal posts. He gathered round him there a number of people of separatist views, and Richard Clifton came from a neighbouring parsonage to minister to them. After a year of tranquillity, dangers began to arise, and the little body made an unsuccessful attempt to escape to Holland in 1607. In the year following fortune favoured them better, and they reached Amsterdam. Some stayed with,

the separatist congregation, of English subjects, established there under the superintendence of Francis Johnson and Henry Ainsworth; others moved on to Leyden, where James Robinson, also newly come from England, became their pastor in 1609. Eight years later the Leyden body conceived a desire to emigrate, and attempted to arrange for money, transport, and license from England: the negotiations were ultimately successful and the way was clear. Passing from Leyden to England, the little body set sail in the *Mayflower* from Plymouth on September 6, 1620, 101 persons in all, and landed on November 11 at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts. The migration passed unnoticed at home: even a shrewd observer would hardly have guessed that the little settlement would at best prove anything more than a safety-valve to avert explosions in England; no one could foresee the great results that were to follow in the new continent.

But while puritanism grew in force, and separatism became more clearly defined, the central church life was also gaining strength and influence. The years that had elapsed since the turmoils of the middle of the last century had given time for more mature reflection. The assertion of nationality which had played a large part in the breach with Rome had become less crude than it had been in its earlier days, and was already beginning to manifest itself in a type of theology and church polity which was instinct with the characteristics of the English nation, and did not cease to be catholic by becoming national. The contest with presbyterian puritanism had been a formative power on one side, just as the controversy with Romanism had been on the other. Not only in England but also to a limited extent abroad men were beginning to realise what this middle position meant, and to grasp more firmly the idea of a catholicism which was not papal in its constitution.

There began in consequence a flow of foreigners towards the English Church, and the current that brought them was one of great interest, even though it did not always bring adherents of much value or credit. Thus at one time there came two Italian friars, who for the moment received a friendly welcome, and became a nine days' wonder. But they soon revealed their

The growth
of the central
church life.

The English
Church
attracts
foreigners;

true colours, and evoked from a caustic lay critic the remark that "there are many such renegadoes ready to abjure for wives and benefices."

Of greater importance than these was Marc' Antonio de Dominis—a Dalmatian by birth and Archbishop of Spalato. English friendships, patristic studies, and the rivalries of Venice and Rome made him hesitate as to the Roman claims, and he was in trouble with his ecclesiastical superiors in 1614. Two years later he fled to England after publishing *A Manifestation of the Motives* which decided him. Much was made of him here: benefices were showered upon him, and means were provided for the publication of his books. In December 1617 he assisted the archbishop at the consecration of new bishops of Bristol and Lincoln. But his quarrelsome and avaricious character soon showed itself, and disappointed ambition led him to hanker after a return. Already, in 1621, the tone of his preaching changed. Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, facilitated his departure by a safe-conduct abroad, and the king hastened it by a decree of banishment. After his reconciliation he was as unstable as ever, and in 1623 he was suspected and cast into prison, where in 1625 he died.

While his visit conferred no lustre on England, the case was very different with Isaac Casaubon, the leading classical scholar of Europe, who became naturalised in 1610, and spent the closing four years of his life in this country. A Gascon by origin, he was born at Geneva in 1559, and spent two-thirds of his life there. His patristic studies prepared the way for his ceasing to be a Calvinist, and ten years' sojourn in Paris, during which much controversial zeal was expended on him, unsettled his early beliefs further, but failed to persuade him to become a Romanist. He therefore turned to the English Church, and found there not only a welcome for his brilliant scholarship, but the haven of peace all ready made for which his devout and conscientious soul had been sighing. His standpoint he found to be practically identical with that of the rising school of English theology; and his personal friendship with Andrews sealed the alliance. His accession was significant not merely as being the gain of a distinguished adherent, but as being

De Dominis,
1566-1625,

and Isaac
Casaubon,
1559-1614.

a proof of the fact that the theological position of the English Church was not in its essence an anomaly or a peculiar outcome of English circumstances, but a position which would appeal to a mind characterised by a combination of sound theological learning with personal piety, wherever such might happen to be found. The point had already been shown once in the case of Hadrian Saravia, the French theologian and pastor who became the defender of English episcopacy in the last decade of the sixteenth century, and the friend and confessor of Hooker. The case of Casaubon the layman did but further emphasise and publish more widely the same significant fact.

Side by side with the recovery of a more liberal and catholic theology, there was going on also a recovery of decency and order in public worship, and some approximation to the standard of external ceremonial and ornament which had been set up at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, but never yet reached. In this respect, as also in matters of theology, the principal leader was the saintly bishop, Lancelot Andrewes, who in 1619 was transferred from Ely to Winchester. To men of his reverent type of mind, emancipated to some extent from the mere prejudices of anti-Roman feeling, it seemed only natural that the three low bows with which the courtier approached the king should be used by the celebrant at his approach to God, and that the reverence which was made towards the empty throne of the monarch should also be made towards the holy Table. Such things as these were the natural outcome of a reverent mind. Other ceremonial enrichments were taken from the practice of the early Church, or from the customs of the East, which seemed at the time less open to misunderstanding than old English or Western ceremonies. Thus there began the habit of turning to the east for the creed at daily prayer and eucharist; the use of a credence-table and of a chalice veil—called by its Eastern name of "air." With all this innovation the preservation of old customs was not neglected: the copes and wafer-bread, the solemn customs of offering at the offertory, the washing of the priest's hands before he prepared the elements, the mingling of water with wine in the chalice,—these and similar customs were resuscitated or carefully preserved. The use of

Development
of externals
and worship
led by
Andrewes.

incense in the service was restored, and a censer formed part of the church plate which Andrewes solemnly consecrated for the dean and chapter in Worcester Cathedral. It does not appear that in any of these respects the bishop was a zealous introducer of high ceremonial; but he carried out his views in his own chapel, and, as they more and more commended themselves, his chapel became the model of other cathedrals besides Worcester, and his example was the standard of a growing school of followers. It is difficult to estimate the effect of such modest influence.

When Andrewes died on September 25, 1626, he left behind him a Church, which he had defended against its enemies on sound catholic lines as no one else had done, which he had filled with a new and richer ^{His general influence} theology, and refreshed with the imperishable fragrance of a saintly example. The little book of his *Private Prayers*, which has done more than anything to spread his fame and influence, was not known outside the narrow circle of his most intimate friends until the next generation. The chief of the extant manuscript copies is one which was given by him to Laud: it thus serves as a link between the two periods; for though Andrewes' death falls in Charles's reign, his life belongs to the earlier period, while Laud's activity, though it was becoming very manifest in James's day, belongs properly to the later era.

Moreover, in spite of the obvious difference of character and circumstances, Laud was the lineal successor of Andrewes; his resistance to the Calvinist theology at Oxford was the counterpart of Andrewes' quiet rebellion at Cambridge, and alike they passed from the highest academic honours to a deanery and to a bishopric. ^{contrasted with the effect of Laud.} No doubt there is a striking contrast between the brusque ways of Laud at Gloucester in forcing innovations upon his chapter and cathedral with regard to the position of the holy Table, and the gentle ways of Andrewes in quietly recovering the dignity of the services at Westminster Abbey, and devoting his leisure to the fatherly care of the boys at the school. But Laud would have been more overbearing still if he had not imbibed from Andrewes the gentleness which showed itself so heroically in the days of his adversity; and

the quiet work of Andrewes would have been robbed of half its best effect if it had not been carried on after his death by the bustling energy of Laud.

It was an immense gain to the Church that so large a part of the transformation that marked the first half of the century had already taken place unobtrusively before it became a matter of rivalry first, and then of open hostility. The liturgical and ceremonial freedom which the bishops exerted in the ways indicated above, or, to quote one more example, in the putting forth of consecration services for church, churchyard, or church ornaments, was but one part of a large liberty which they successfully vindicated for themselves of acting freely on their own inherent episcopal authority in spheres which were not closed to them by the terms of the compact with the state or the limitations of statute law.

Under this fostering and fatherly care piety and churchmanship alike revived; old churches were restored and new ones built; opportunities of churchgoing and worship, of confession and communion, multiplied; sacramental belief was enriched; even the scope of prayer was widened as Andrewes' example and teaching spread and men learnt to take a wider sweep in intercession for the living and the departed. The seed-plot of the Church, which had to many seemed bare and unlovely since it had been weeded, began to show again its power to produce saintly souls such as George Herbert or the household of Nicholas Ferrar. Devotional literature multiplied and taught men no longer to be content with three communions in a year, made for the sake of conformity, and in some cases all crowded into the eight days from Palm Sunday to Easter, while the rest of the year was left starved. The remarkable outburst of musical ability, which in the later Elizabethan days had been almost entirely secular, consecrated itself again to the service of God, until at last in 1641 it was again worth while, for the first time since 1563, to print a great collection of services and anthems for use in divine worship.

Yet with all this, no far-seeing man could dare to be optimistic about the state of religion. The Church was making all the while a fatal error in leaning too much upon the royal

prerogative, and in despising and combating overmuch the nascent aspirations after more constitutional government. The alliance of puritanism and politics had too many points of strength in it, and the alliance of Church and Crown too many points of weakness, to allow any churchman to look forward into the immediate future without grave apprehension.

But signs of
danger
ahead.

AUTHORITIES.—For the general history see Gardiner and other authorities already cited.

The report as to Bancroft's deathbed is from *A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1610. James's explanation of his appointment of Abbot is in *S.P. Dom.* lxi. 107. In the same volume are documents about the prohibitions, and also in British Museum MSS. Faustina, D. vi., Cleopatra, F. ii.; cp. Coke, *Institutes*, iv., and *Reports*, xii. For the Portuguese heretic see *S.P. Dom.* xcvi.

For the Northamptonshire ministers see Collier and *S.P. Dom.* lxxvii. For the dealings with Lewis Baily, *S.P. Dom.* lxxi. There is much that concerns the dealings with recusants in *S.P. Dom.*, especially vols. lxxviii.-lxxi. lxxx. lxxxiii. lxxxviii. xcvi. For the Jesuits and Seculars see above. The affairs of parliaments are recorded in the *Journals*, and are frequently illustrated by the *S.P. Dom.*, also by Yonge, *Diary* (Camden Soc.). The comment on the Spanish match is from *S.P. Dom.* cxvi., the order against preaching on the subject is in *S.P. Dom.* cxviii. The sabbatarian trouble at Salisbury is recorded in *S.P. Dom.* lxiv., the case of Gerard Prior in lxxi.

For the Synod of Dort see Fuller, *Life of Davenant*. For the exodus of Separatists, Dexter, *u.s.*, several articles in the *Dictionary Nat. Biog.*, and Arber, *Pilgrim Fathers*. The Italian friars and de Dominis figure in *S.P. Dom.*, and there is a life of the latter by Newland. Casaubon is best studied in Pattison's *Life*.

For Andrewes' ceremonial see his *Minor Works* (Anglo-Catholic Library), and for his Prayers see Mr. Brightman's edition of *Preces Privatae*. The custom of crowding communions at Holy Week and Easter is shown by churchwardens' accounts. See a list of those which are in print in *English Hist. Review*, xv. (April 1900), 335-341. For Barnard's *Church Music*, see Grove, *Dictionary of Music*, art. "Barnard."



APPENDIX I


SOME PRINCIPAL EVENTS

	A.D.
Accession of Elizabeth	Nov. 17, 1558
The First Parliament	Jan.-May, 1559
Act of Supremacy	1559
Act of Uniformity	1559
Royal Visitation	June, 1559
The Ecclesiastical Commission	July 19, 1559
Jewel's Challenge	Nov. 26, 1559
Parker's Consecration	Dec. 17, 1559
<i>The Interpretations and Further Considerations</i>	1560
Mission of Parpaglia	1560
The New Kalendar	1561
Mission of Martinengo	1561
The Second Parliament and Convocation	Jan.-April, 1563
<i>The XXXVIII. Articles</i>	1563
The Royal Letter against religious varieties	Jan. 25, 1565
The vestiarian troubles	1565
<i>The Advertisements</i>	March 28, 1566
The Third Parliament and Convocation	Oct., 1566
The beginnings of separatism	1567
Mary of Scotland enters England	May, 1568
The founding of the Douai Seminary	1568
The Northern Rebellion	Nov., 1569
The bull of excommunication published	June, 1570
The puritan outburst at Cambridge	1570
The Fourth Parliament and Convocation	April-June, 1571
<i>The XXXIX. Articles</i>	1571
<i>The Book of Discipline</i>	1571
The Ridolfi plot	Sept., 1571
The Fifth Parliament, first session	May, 1572
The execution of Norfolk	June 2, 1572
<i>The Admonition to Parliament</i>	1572
The death of Parker and accession of Grindal	May 17, 1575
The second session of the Fifth Parliament	Feb., 1576
The Canons	March 17, 1576
The suppression of "prophesying"	1577
The execution of Mayne	Nov. 30, 1577
The invasion of Ireland	1579
The advent of the Jesuits	1580
The third session of the Fifth Parliament	Jan., 1581
The execution of Campion	Dec. 1, 1581

	A.D.
The executions of Coppin and Thacker	June, 1583
The death of Grindal	July 6, 1583
Whitgift issues his articles	1583
Throgmorton's plot	1583
The Sixth Parliament	Nov., 1584
Parry's plot	1584
Plot of Ballard and Babington	1586
The Seventh Parliament	Oct., 1586
The execution of Queen Mary	Feb. 8, 1587
The Marprelate libels	1588
The Spanish Armada	1588
The Eighth Parliament	Nov., 1589
Bancroft's sermon at Paul's Cross	Feb. 9, 1589
The execution of Barrow and Greenwood	April 6, 1593
The Ninth Parliament	Feb., 1593
The Wisbeach stirs	1594
The Lambeth Articles	1595
The Tenth Parliament	Oct., 1597
The Archpriest controversy	1598
The Eleventh Parliament	Oct., 1601
The death of Elizabeth and accession of James	March 24, 1603
The "Main" and the "Bye" plots	1603
The Millenary petition	1603
The Hampton Court Conference	Jan. 14-18, 1604
The death of Whitgift	Feb. 29, 1604
The first session of the First Parliament	March, 1604
The Canons	1604
The Powder Plot	Nov. 5, 1605
The second session of the First Parliament	Nov., 1605
The Oath of Allegiance	1605
"Overall's Convocation Book"	1605
Andrewes becomes bishop	Nov. 3, 1605
The contest about prohibitions	1606
The case of N. Fuller	1606
The third session of the First Parliament	Nov., 1606
The fourth and fifth sessions of the First Parliament	Feb. and Oct. 1610
The Scottish consecrations	Oct. 21, 1610
The death of Bancroft	Nov. 2, 1610
Renewed contest about prohibitions	1610
The marriage of the Lady Elizabeth	1612
The death of Prince Henry	Nov. 6, 1612
The Essex divorce suit	1613
The Second Parliament	April, 1614
The Spanish marriage of Prince Charles first proposed	1617
The <i>Book of Sports</i>	1617
The Synod of Dort	1619
The voyage of the <i>Mayflower</i>	1620
Abbot's homicide	1621
The Third Parliament	Nov., 1621
The Spanish journey	1623
The Fourth Parliament	Feb.-Nov., 1624
The death of James	1625

APPENDIX II

SOVEREIGNS		ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY		ARCHBISHOPS OF YORK	
	Accession.		Accession.		Accession.
Elizabeth	1558	Reginald Pole . . .	1556	Nicholas Heath . .	1555
		Matthew Parker . .	1559	Thomas Young . . .	1561
		Edmund Grindal . .	1575	Edmund Grindal . .	1570
		John Whitgift . . .	1583	Edwin Sandys . . .	1577
James I.	1603	Richard Bancroft . .	1604	John Piers	1589
		George Abbot . . .	1610	Matthew Futton . .	1595
				Tobias Matthew . .	1606



INDEX

- Abbot*, Archbp. of Canterbury, his career, 366; his qualifications, 367; his appointment, 368; his appeal to the Council, 368; unpopularity of, 371; judgment of, in the Essex divorce suit, 372; his incapacity, 378; his accidental homicide, 378
- Abbot, Dr.*, his defence of Perkins, 345
- Admonition to the parliament*, issue of, 178; style of, 179; effect of, 180, 195; copies not surrendered, 185
- Advertisements*, 68, 194, 320; issued by Parker, 118; their authority, 118; distribution of, 120; scope of, 121; status of, 167; misunderstood, 229
- Aglionby*, on liberty of conscience, 160
- Ainsworth, Henry*, at Amsterdam, 384
- À Lasco's* opinion on Hooper's case, 116
- Alençon, Duke of*, unpopularity of his suit, 197
- Alison's* "Plaine Confutation," 263
- Allen, Cardinal*, an uncompromising recusant, 78; founds college at Douai, 138; his arrest ordered, 141; political views of, 212; pamphlets of, 239; made cardinal, 267; his bad influence, 270, 271
- Alley*, Bp. of Exeter, his liturgical proposals, 98
- Almuce*, forbidden, 167
- Allar*, treatment of, in London, 32; to be replaced by table, 38; destruction of, at St. Paul's, 42; ornaments of, in royal chapel, 52; direction for use of holy Table, 59; Park-hurst's direction concerning, 62; in the north, 67; varying position, 115; desecration by recusants, 144
- Alva*, in the Low Countries, 148; reluctant to issue papal bull, 150; hostile to England, 176; his successes, 206
- Alvey*, Master of the Temple, his death, 235
- Anabaptists*, 370; a term of reproach, 261
- Andrewes, Lancelot*, Bp. of Chichester, Ely, Winchester, tries to convert recusants, 242; in conference with separatists, 262; his influence on theology, 254, 344; his career, 343; his reply to Tortus, 346; his reply to Bellarmine, 348; his reply to Du Perron, 349; his "Theological Determination," 356; his relations with Abbot, 371; his mildness to recusants, 374; growth of his school of thought, 377; his self-restraint, 383; his piety, 386; his death, 387
- Anjou, Duke of*, suitor to Elizabeth, 176
- Antwerp*, sack of, 206; recusants at, 209
- "*Apology*" of Jewel, 90
- Aquila*, Spanish Ambassador, his report on plot against Elizabeth, 93
- Archduke Charles of Austria*, suitor to Elizabeth, 53
- Arches*, Court of, its jurisdiction, 360
- Armada, The Spanish*, 254; failure of, 255; recusant relations to, 272
- Arminius, Jacob*, his rebellion against Calvinism, 382; conference with his followers, 383

- Arthington*, plot against Elizabeth, 263
- Articles*, of 1560, 60, 97; of convocation, 97
- Articles of the Bishops of 1565*, 115; refused by Elizabeth, 117; but re-issued as the "Advertisements," 118; their enforcement, 119
- Articles of Religion*, reviewed, 97; proposed statute for, 133; subscription to, 162; the *Thirty-nine*, 163-164
- Articles of Whitgift*, 1583, 224; puritan protests against, 227
- Articles of Abuses* (Bancroft's), 357, 361
- Articles*, the Lambeth Articles, 283, 306, 344
- Ashley*, his execution, 329
- Axton, William*, trial of, 173
- Aylmer*, Bp. of London, libel of, in Marprelate "Epistle," 250, 251; suspends Cawdray, 281; his sentence on Cawdray, 282
- Babington*, his plot in favour of Mary, 244; confession and execution, 245
- Bacon, Lady*, translates Jewel's "Apology," 90
- Bacon, Sir F.*, his view of puritanism, 291; advocates royal prerogative, 357; supports Bancroft, 361
- Bacon, Sir N.*, becomes Lord Keeper, 6; responsibility of, 14; his opening speech to parliament, 17; moderator of the Westminster disputation, 24; terrified at religious discontent, 34; speech on religious abuses, 95; his declaration of liberty of conscience, 151. *See also* 172
- Baily Lewis*, Bp. of Bangor, his sermon on the decay of piety, 373
- Baily*, execution of, 325
- Bale*, Bp. of Ossory, summoned to Parker's consecration, 47
- Ballard*, instigates Babington's plot, 244; executed, 245
- Bancroft*, Archbishop of Canterbury, his sermon at Paul's Cross, 275, 366; controversial books of, 275; as Bishop of London at Hampton Court Conference, 296, 304, 306; his bill against simony, 303; succeeds Whitgift, 308; his dealings with the Commons, 312, 313; with the Puritans, 317; translation to Canterbury, 318; his directions on conformity, 319; his returns of puritans, 321; his measures against recusants, 325; recusant appeal to, 330; drafts oath of allegiance, 331; defends his action against nonconformists, 332; his policy, 334; protests against prohibitions, 356; his "Articles of Abuses," 357, 361; appeals to James in the Fuller case, 360; success with puritans, 362; labour at reforms, 364; work, 367
- Barlow*, Bp. of Bath and Wells, presides at Parker's consecration, 47
- Barnes*, Bp. of Durham, his report on Carlisle, 152; his restrictions on baptism, 192; his dealings with recusants, 214
- Baro*, recedes from Calvinism, 283
- Baronius*, on the papal system, 333
- Barrett, William*, censured at Cambridge, 283
- Barrow, Henry*, his conversion to Independency, 258; imprisoned, 259; before the Council, 260; conferences with, 261; in prison, 263; execution of, 264, 269; Whitgift's mercy to, 305
- Bartlett*, lecturer at St. Giles', Cripplegate, confined by Grindal, 123
- Bath and Wells diocese*, 63
- Bayles*, execution of, 266
- Bayley*, displaces Cawdray, 281
- Beale, Robert*, Clerk to the Council, attacks Whitgift, 229; in parliament, 277; vestiarian argument, 319
- Bell, Thomas*, recants, 268; as a controversialist, 345
- Bellarmino, Cardinal*, his writings on the papal system, 333; his remonstrance to Blackwell, 337; a papist protagonist, 344; his letter to Blackwell, 345; his reply to James I.'s "Apology," 346; crude views of supremacy, 347; "Apologia," 348
- Benefices, Augmentation of*, convocation and, 100; inquiry into, 102; census of benefices, 103; the pro-

- blem in St. David's, 153; need for, 302
- Bennet*, Bp. of Hereford, his spoliations, 303
- Bentham, Thos.*, ultimately Bp. of Coventry and Lichfield, officiates in London, 9
- Berkeley*, Bp. of Bath and Wells, his financial difficulties, 63
- Best*, Bp. of Carlisle, reports on his diocese, 67, 77
- Besa, T.*, appealed to on the vestiarian question, 124
- Bible*, the English, versions of, 299; the Authorised Version, 300
- Bidding prayer*, ordered, 37
- Bill, Dr.*, commissioner for revision of prayer-book, 8; ecclesiastical commissioner, 44
- Bilson, Bp.*, his "True Difference," 239; appointed to Winchester, 303
- Bird, James*, a boy recusant, 269
- Birkhead, Archpriest*, displaces Blackwell, 337
- Bishop, William*, attacks Perkins, 345; made Bp. of Chalcedon, 375
- Blackfan, Archpriest*, arrested, 373
- Blackwell, George*, Archpriest of seculars, 272; his proceedings, 273; discloses Bye Plot, 288; his inability to stop riots, 326; his repudiation of the Gunpowder Plot, 335; his vacillation on the oath, 336; takes the oath, 337
- Bluet*, leader of seculars, 271; his negotiations with the Council, 273
- Bonner*, Bp. of London, rejected by Elizabeth, 2; opens convocation, 18; maintains the old use at St. Paul's, 33; deprived, 34; sent to Marshalsea, 56; his firmness, 71; proceedings against, 130; his technical objections, 131, 133, 134
- Bonham*, 128
- Bono*, execution of, 266
- Bourne*, Bp. of Bath and Wells, his doubts on the Supremacy Oath, 35; deprived, 45; his financial treatment of his see, 63
- Bredwell*, his attack on Glover, 260
- Brewster, William*, separatist following of, 383
- Briant*, arrested, 219; execution of, 220; torture, 238
- Bridger*, petitions parliament, 311
- Bridges*, Dean of Salisbury, replies to the "Learned Discourse," 249; Marprelate answers to, 250, 251
- Bright*, confers with puritans, 262
- Bristow*, at Douai, 207; his "Motives," 309
- Browne, Robert*, 196; first Independent, 202; flight of, 203; pamphlets of, 203; his submission, 258
- Bucer*, on Hooper's case, 116, 122
- Bull, papal*, excommunicating Elizabeth, 149; publication of, 150; penalties for importing, 160
- Bullinger*, appealed to on clerical dress, 112; his letter to Horne, 116; reiterates his advice to conform, 123; his disapproval of non-conformity, 125; his treatise on bull of excommunication, 151; his letter to Whitgift, 181
- Bullingham, Archdeacon*, at Parker's consecration, 48
- Bunny*, his devotional work, 285
- Burgess, John*, his rebellion against the canons, 315; his interview with James, 316, 317; his estimate of puritan strength, 321
- Burghley*. See Cecil.
- Burial service* on Genevan model, 32
- Caietan, Cardinal*, protector of English College at Rome, 272
- Calais*, loss of, 1
- Calfhill, James*, replies to Martial, 84
- Calvin*, his influence on exiles, 8; his advice on conformity and communion of the sick, 79; his catechism used, 169; his influence on puritanism, 282; Whitgift's relations with, 306; growth of Calvinistic tenets, 382
- Cambridge*, 155; favours the new views, 66; usages at, 115; vestiarian troubles at, 117; parodies of the Eucharist at, 130; troubles with recusants at, 137; puritan discontent at, 183; theological disputes at, 283; opposes Millenary Petition, 294; puritans at, 318;

- its theological school, 342; its rebellion against Calvinism, 382
- Campion, Father*, 340; character of, 216; in London, 217; hunted, 218; captured, 219; tried and executed, 220; his offence, 221; counted a martyr, 238
- Canons* (of 1571), 164, 166; (of 1576) 192; upheld by civil courts, 282; (of 1604) 313; parliament's objections to, 364
- Canterbury*, diocese of, 62, 155; Elizabeth visits, 188
- Carew*, Dean of chapel royal, 11
- Carlisle diocese*, 152
- Carr*, Earl of Somerset, his union with Countess of Essex, 372
- Carrier*, his defection, 374
- Cartwright, Thomas*, puritan leader, 155; ejected from Cambridge, 156; on vestments, 167; writes the Second Admonition, 180; his reply to Whitgift, 182; in hiding, 184; his Second Reply, 196; his advocacy of Geneva, 200; at Middleburg, 203; his controversy with Independents, 260; arrested, 263; before the Commission, 278; before the Star Chamber, 279; released by Whitgift, 280, 305
- Casaubon, Isaac*, in England, 385
- Cassander, George*, quoted in favour of crucifix, 54
- Catechism*, ordered to the laity, 167; use of Calvin's, 169; Dean Nowell's, 97, 167, 298; Overall's, 298
- Catesby*, devises the Gunpowder Plot, 324; killed, 327
- Cathedral Chapters*, visitation of, 61; scandals in, 106
- Cawdray, Robert*, his attack on the prayer-book, 281; case of, 282
- Cecil, Robert*, Earl of Salisbury, Chancellor of Cambridge, 318; his opinion of puritans, 321; recusant hatred of, 335
- Cecil, William*, Lord Burghley, 164, 231, 283; secretary, 2; history and character, 3; his "Device," 5; responsibility of, 14; conveys refusal of Supreme Headship, 25; explains royal supremacy, 38; on visitations, 40; on Parker's consecration, 47; his unpromising religious policy, 51; urges appointment of bishops, 59; supports marriage of clergy, 69; circulates Jewel's "Apology," 90; his excuse for anti-recusant laws, 100; on clerical dress, 112; drafts royal edict, 114; but abandons Parker in its enforcement, 115; information of, 141; Chancellor of Cambridge, 156; created Lord Burghley, 159; condemns Whittingham, 173; his spies, 176; plot against, 177; praises the zeal of the Council, 185; his dealings with Browne, 202; protests in favour of puritans, 229; allows the oath *ex officio*, 230; his pamphlets on Jesuit treason, 238; urges reply to Marprelate, 251; dealings with Cawdray, 281; his relations with Whitgift, 305
- Chaderton*, at Hampton Court Conference, 296
- Champneys*, his writings, 374
- Chancy, Sir William*, imprisoned, 368
- Chapel Royal*, innovations begin at, 5, 6; mass in English at, 22; sacrament removed from, 33; ornaments rubric in force at, 53
- Chapman, John*, recusant priest, 241
- Chark*, 183; replies to Campion, 217
- Charles I.*, King of England, plans for his marriage, 379; his journey to Spain, 380
- Cheke, Sir John*, his "Hurt of Sedition," 145
- Chester diocese*, 139, 152
- Cheyney*, Bp. of Gloucester, his Lutheran tendencies, 114; tried by convocation, 162
- Chichester diocese*, 154, 213
- Chichester executions*, 267
- Chope*, the case of his institution, 334
- Christopherson*, Bp. of Chichester, sent to prison, 11; his death, 12
- Clarke*, executed for Bye Plot, 288
- Clarke, Thomas*, his recantation, 268
- Clifton, Richard*, his separatist opinions, 383
- Clithero, Margaret*, execution of, 255
- Cobham, Lord*, his share in the Main Plot, 288
- Coke, Sir E.*, Speaker of the Commons, 277; on confession, 328;

- Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas, 352; opposes Bancroft's Articles, 357; limits oath *ex officio*, 358; his dispute with James I., 361; grants prohibitions, 368; maintains his position, 368, 369; his view of the Commission's powers, 370
- Cole*, Dean of St. Paul's, speaks at Westminster disputation, 24; tries to trap Jewel, 87
- Colleton*, his "Petition Apologetical," 309
- Commission, Ecclesiastical*, provided by Act of Supremacy, 26; its functions, 28; allows Metrical Psalter, 44; established by letters-patent, 44; deprives Marian Bishops, 45; ordered to protect churches, 68; trial of Crowley before, 120; its concessions to nonconformity, 121; its proceedings against nonconformists, 122; restrains liberty of press, 123, 235; powers of, 133; enforces clerical subscription, 171; reappointment of, 227; its proceedings, 229, 334; deals with Snape, 278; puritan attack on, 311; powers of its Court, 353; complaints against, 354; reasons for its Court, 355; its powers limited by the civil judges, 358; its dealings with Fuller, 359; disputes with the civil courts, 368, 369; processes against heretics, 370
- Communion, compulsory*, enacted, 100; protests against, 160, 164; effect of, 290; penalties for refusing, 330
- Communion in both kinds*, proposed, 5; at Elizabeth's coronation, 11; authorised, 22; justified in Articles (of 1560), 60; enforced by the Council, 161
- Conventicles*, first formation of, 127
- Convocation*, protests against reform, 18; denies lay authority in religion, 19; changed composition of, 96; draws up Articles of Religion, 97; puritan proposals in, 98; ecclesiastical discipline, 100; session of 1566, 132; dealings with Cheyney, 162; dealings with Articles, 163; passes Canons (of 1576), 192; petitions Elizabeth on behalf of Grindal, 195; demands for reform in lower house, 199; enforces the Canons, 245; puritan petition to, 246; ecclesiastical legislation of, 277; puritan proposals to, 309; at issue with parliament, 311; passes Canons (of 1604), 313; passes "Convocation book," 333
- Cooper*, Bp. of London and Winchester, intervenes in Jewel controversy, 88; on the "Admonition," 180; answers Marprelate, 251
- Cooper*, conference with, 262
- Cope*, proposes puritan legislation, 246
- Copinger*, plot against Elizabeth, 263
- Coppin*, execution of, 204
- Corpus Christi*, the procession abandoned, 33
- Cosin, Dr.*, his justification of the oath *ex officio*, 279, 356; his argument on *præmunire*, 361
- Cotton*, Bp. of Salisbury, his election to Salisbury, 303
- Cotton, Mr.*, in conference with puritans, 262
- Council, The Privy*, problems of (in 1558), 3; its plans for religious reform, 4; its troubles with disorders, 23; arranges Westminster disputation, 24; imprisons Marian bishops, 25; its anxiety over Supremacy oath, 34; advises restoration of church autonomy, 49; refuses to receive the Nuncio, 75; its inquiries into the dioceses, 103; fails Parker, 120; its proceedings against nonconformists, 122; restrains liberty of press, 123; its dealings with magistrates, 134; with Lancashire, 142; and with Mary's party, 143; its orders to Sussex, 144; repressive measures of, 145; enforces communion test, 161; its action against puritans, 183; its letter to the bishops, 185; its toleration of prophesying, 187; its action during Grindal's sequestration, 195; its repression of puritans, 196, 197; censures Wentworth, 198; its dealings with recusants, 208, 209; its measures against Jesuits, 217; leniency of, 218; hampers Whitgift,

- 227, 228, 229; its press restrictions, 235; its management of elections, 245; assists the seculars, 273; urges enforcement of conformity, 318; reprimands Hastings, 320; its reply to Bancroft's protest on prohibitions, 356; limits oath *ex officio*, 358; disputes in, 351; Abbot's appeal to, 368; indecisive policy, 369
- Council of the North*, 67, 139, 144, 217, 360
- Courts of Law*, relations between ecclesiastical and civil, 350, etc.; conflicts between jurisdictions, 356, 358, 359, 361, 368
- Coventry*, Mary Queen of Scots at, 145
- Coverdale*, Bp. of Exeter, 1; at Parker's consecration, 47; invokes Geneva, 124
- Cowell, Dr.*, his "Interpreter," 361
- Cox*, Bp. of Ely, returns from exile, commissioner for prayer-book revision, 8; preaches at opening of parliament, 14; ecclesiastical commissioner, 44; consecrated Bp. of Ely, 48; protests against ornaments, 54; counsels conformity, 54; on the marriage of clergy, 69; custodian of Feckenham, 85
- Crane*, 128
- Crockett*, execution of, 267
- Crowley*, of S. Giles, Cripplegate, deprivation of, 120; pamphlets issued by, 122
- Cumberland, Earl of*, his influence in the north, 67
- Curteys*, Bp. of Chichester, his measures against recusancy, 213
- Dacre, Leonard*, his rebellion, 146
- Dacre, Lord*, his influence in the north, 67
- Dalton*, on liberty of conscience, 160
- Davies*, Bp. of St. Asaph, 63
- Davies, William*, in prison, 268
- Davy, Robert*, execution of, 340
- Day*, Bp. of Winchester, 303
- Declaration of the Queen's proceedings* since her reign, 146
- De Dominis*, Archbp. of Spalato, his career, 385
- Dering, Edward*, his troubles, 183; and final suspension, 184; an unsuitable champion of the Church, 342
- Diocesan statistics*, 103
- Discipline, Book of*, published, 195; its influence, 225, 229; amended and adopted by puritan party, 247; plot to establish, 263; puritan adherence to, 281
- Disorders, Religious*, at Austin Friars, 9; in favour of change, 22; at Bow Church, 23; in London, 32; at the royal visitation, 42; at Exeter, 43; destruction of ornaments, 53; following the Advertisements, 120, a cause of recusancy, 129
- Divine Right*, adoption of the theory of, 310, 333
- Donne, John*, his career, 348; his share in controversy, 349
- Dorman*, his attack on Jewel, 89; at Douai, 207
- Dort*, puritan press at, 261; protestant conference at, 383
- Douai*, English recusants settle at, 138; first fruits of, 207; the seminaries of, 208; pamphlets from, 209; its emissaries, 210; its relations with the Jesuits, 216
- Downman*, Bp. of Chester, his lax proceedings against recusants, 139; rebuked by the government, 141; refuses to prosecute, 142
- Dunbar, Earl of*, Scottish Treasurer, 366; suggests Abbot for Canterbury, 367
- Earbury*, imprisoned, 313
- Earl*, of St. Mildred's, his account of trial at Lambeth, 119
- Edwards*, takes oath of supremacy, 267
- Egerton*, conference with, 262
- Elevation of the Host*, given up in chapel royal, 5; forbidden by Elizabeth, 9; omitted at her coronation, 11
- Eliot, John*, recantation of, 268
- Elizabeth*, Queen of England, early history of, 2; her hold on her people, 4; at mass, 4, 5, 9; her coronation, 10; her attitude towards the mass, 16; disregards first Act

- of Supremacy, 21; hears mass in English, 22; prorogues parliament, 30; her cautious foreign policy, 50; her unpromising religious policy, 51; her statecraft, 51; her views on matrimony and religion, 52; her religious views subordinate to policy, 53; her mildness to the Marian bishops, 57; her reluctance to fill vacant sees, 59; orders protection of churches, 68; her dislike of married clergy, 68; orders restoration of churches, 70; her reception of Pius IV.'s letter, 73; her attitude towards the Council of Trent, 75; her reasons, 76; plot against, 93; illness of, 99; her mildness to recusants, 102; on clerical dress, 113; edict on episcopal disunion, 114; her irresolution, 115; refuses to support Parker, 117; the question of her marriage, 132; her action on the Articles Bill, 133; her answer to the Emperor, 135; her Maundy rites, 135; Declaration of her proceedings, 146; papal excommunication of, 149; her lack of money, 158; vetoes Church Attendance Bill, 161; her treatment of parliament, 161; her attitude towards the Canons (of 1572), 166; suspicious of Parker, 175; her treatment of Norfolk and Mary, 177; forbids parliamentary interference with the Church, 178; her proclamation against pamphlets, 185; orders suppression of prophesyings, 186; her visit to Parker, 188; her financial treatment of the Church, 191; vetoes Canons, 192; calls on Grindal to suppress conventicles, 193; sequesters Grindal, 194; suppresses puritan proposals in parliament, 198; refuses Sandys' programme of reform, 199; vetoes Sabbatarian Bill, 231; her general support of the bishops, 232; plots against, 241; her courage, 242; association for the preservation of, 242; reluctance to have Mary executed, 245; quashes puritan legislation, 247; effect of her church policy, 257; stops puritan action in parliament, 277; her death, 285; her spoliation of the Church, 303
- Elizabeth, Princess*, betrothal of, 378
- Espes, Don Guerau de*, Spanish Ambassador, supports Mary of Scotland, 141
- Essex, Countess of*, her divorce suit, 371, 372
- Eton*, visitation by Parker, 65
- Excommunication*, proposals of convocation, 100; defence of its general use, 200; discussed at Hampton Court, 296; proposals concerning, 301; Bancroft's scheme for, 332
- Exeter diocese*, 316
- Exiles abroad*, their return, 6; their views, 8
- Faculties, Court of*, reformed by Grindal, 193
- Family of Love*, 187, 295
- Fast-days*, ordered by parliament, 101
- Fawkes, Guy*, and the Gunpowder Plot, 324; arrested, 326, 327
- Feckenham, John*, alias Howman, Abbot of Westminster, 270; speech against Act of Uniformity, 29; his pamphlet, 84; his death, 85
- Felton*, execution of, 150, 208
- Fenner*, at Middelburg, 203
- Feria, Count*, Spanish Ambassador, his report on Cecil, 2; on change of religion, 4; his complaints of riots, 9; his report on the Coronation Mass, 11; his estimate of parties, 15; of the Commons, 15; of the peace with France, 19; fails to understand the Supremacy, 26; urges Kitchin to refuse Supremacy oath, 35; his fear for the Marian bishops, 56; transmits money from the Pope, 57; his opinion of the Bishops' Articles, 61
- Ferrar, Nicholas*, 388
- Field, John*, author of *Admonition*, 179; his punishment, 180; popularity of, 182
- Fitzgerald, James*, his attempt on Ireland, 215
- Fitsimmons*, writings of, 374
- Fleetwood*, 160
- Foreign protestants*, at Austin Friars, 9; in the Netherlands, 51; a

- weapon against Spain, 52; Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 181, 206
Fotheringhay, Mary's trial and execution at, 245
Foxe, John, writes against Osorio, 82; issues the "Reformatio Legum," 165
France, policy as regards England, 3, 4, 16, 176; peace with England, 19; Philip's fear of, 50; Gallicanism in, 74; massacre of Vassy, 80; growing danger from, 99; catholic reaction in, 206; massacre of St. Bartholomew, 206; friendship for, 380
Frankfort, Marian exiles at, 8; Jewel's confession at, 86
Frederick, Elector Palatine, betrothed to Princess Elizabeth, 378
Freke, Bp. of Norwich, his action against puritans, 196
Fulke, William, controversialist, 84
Fuller, Nicholas, associated with Morice, 282; tried by the Commission, 359; his appeal partly allowed, 360; his proposals in parliament, 376
Gardiner, Bp., 3
Garnet, Henry, a Jesuit emissary, 270; appointed "agent," 272; his inability to stop disturbances, 326; implicated in Gunpowder Plot, 327; his trial, 328; execution of, 329; effect of his examination, 335
Gawton, Richard, suspended, 196
Gellibrand, imprisoned, 234
Geneva, its influence on English religion, 8; denounced at Queen Mary's funeral, 12; repugnant to Elizabeth, 16; its contempt for her policy, 51; opposed to clerical dress, 54; the puritan model, 94; puritan appeal to, 124; its orders tested in England, 201
Gerard, Father, in the Clink, 268; discloses Bye Plot, 288; his escape after Gunpowder Plot, 327; exempted from pardon, 335
Gibson, Thos., trial of, 204
Gifford, his "Donatists of England," 263
Gilby, Anthony, 175; his "View of Antichrist," 196
Glover, attacked by Bredwell, 260
Goldwell, Bp., flees abroad, 56; type of new exiles, 71; his death, 216
Gondomar, Spanish Ambassador, forwards Spanish Marriage project, 379; deals with de Dominis, 385
Goodman, his recantation, 175
Goodrich, R., his "Divers Points of Religion," 4, 5; policy adopted, 10
Greenway, implicated in Gunpowder Plot, 327; exempted from pardon, 335
Greenwood, embraces Independency, 258; in prison, 259; varying fortunes of, 260; conferences with, 262; execution of, 264, 269
Grey, Lord, imprisoned, 288
Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury, returns from exile, 8; commissioner for prayer-book revision, 8; on the progress of Supremacy Act, 19; his sermon at Paul's Cross, 33; ecclesiastical commissioner, 44; Bishop of London, 48; argues against ornaments, 54; his large ordinations, 60; a reluctant conformist, 71; his favour to puritanism, 110; forced to proceed against nonconformists, 117; supports Parker, 118; his action, 122; falls into line with other bishops, 123; states the conformist side to Beza, 124; suppresses conventicles, 127; his mildness, 128; his report on York, 151; his dealings with Whittingham, 173; his justification of the bishops, 174; his ineffectiveness, 191; his reform of faculties, 193; his dealings with puritan meetings, 194; sequestered by Elizabeth, 194; his death, 195; his mildness towards puritans, 196; his opportunism, 201; his legacy to his successor, 223, 305
Grissold, execution of, 325
Gualter, his opinion on clerical dress, 116; reiterates advice to conform, 123; his letter to Whitgift, 181
Guest, Edmund his career, 27; at Parker's consecration, 48; on clerical dress, 113; his opinion of

- Article xxviii., 163; protests against compulsory communion, 164
- Hackett*, plots against Elizabeth, 263
- Haddon, Dr.*, replies to Osorio, 81
- Haigh*, receives without communicating, 290
- Hall*, subwarden of Merton, his activity against change, 66
- Hampton Court Conference*, convened, 296; results of, 298; proclamation about, 314
- Hanmer*, his reply to Campion, 217
- Hanse, Everard*, execution of, 220
- Harding, Thomas*, his answer to Jewel, 88, 89; answers Jewel's "Apology," 91; papal commission to, 140; controversy with Dering, 183
- Harrison, Robert*, 258, allies himself with Browne, 202; flight of, 203
- Hartwell*, translates Haddon's reply to Osorio, 82
- Hastings, Sir Francis*, moves the Commons for committee on church reform, 311; confers with the Bishops, 312; reprimanded by the Council, 320; his controversy with Parsons, 345
- Hatton, Sir C.*, his reply to puritan proposals, 246
- Hawkesworth*, denounces Sicklemore, 328
- Hay, Lord*, his farming of recusant fines, 338
- Heath*, Archbishop of York, ceases to be Keeper, 6; refuses to crown Elizabeth, 11; joins in prosecuting White, 12; speaks against Supremacy Act, 19, 26; at Westminster disputation, 24; deprived, 35
- Henrietta Maria, Queen*, her marriage contract, 380
- Henry*, Prince of Wales, his death, 372; puritan hopes of, 373
- Henry IV.*, King of France, assassinated, 340; effect of his murder on James I., 363
- Herbert, George*, his work, 388
- Hereford diocese*, 63
- Heylyn*, his estimate of puritan numbers, 321
- Heywood, Father Jasper*, his quarrel with the Seculars, 271; uncle of Donne, 349
- Hildersham*, sent to prison, 317
- Hill, Thomas*, controversies of, 344
- Hodgkin*, Bp.-Suffragan of Bedford, at Parker's consecration, 47
- Hodgkins*, printer of Marprelate pamphlets, 253
- Holt, Father*, his intrigues, 241
- Holywood*, inventor of Nag's Head Fable, 374
- Hooker, Richard*, 182, 257; master of the Temple, 235; his "Ecclesiastical Polity," 236; his influence, 284; his use of confession, 285; his marriage, 304
- Hooper, Bp.*, his scruples as to dress, 54, 116, 124
- Horne*, Bp. of Winchester, pleads for more "workmen," 58; his visitation, 64; at Winchester and Oxford, 65; his ruling on the priesthood, 66; his controversy with Feckenham, 85; his opinion on clerical dress, 116; his prosecution of Bonner, 130; his proceedings at Oxford, 136
- House of Commons*, 338; questions writs without the title "Supreme Head," 17; rejects Supremacy Act, 18; passes the revised act, 18, 20; its ecclesiastical action stopped by Elizabeth, 133; puritan sympathies in, 159; petitions for reformation, 198; puritan articles exhibited in, 199; attempted interference in church matters, 231; last Elizabethan struggle for ecclesiastical power, 246, 277; puritan sympathies of, 309; at issue with convocation, 311; conferences with the Bishops, 312; puritan grievances before, 332; its attack on the episcopate, 333; and on the Commission, 358; financial conflict with the Crown, 362; breach with the king, 375; puritan measures of, 376; puritan violence in, 377, 380; sabbatarian proposals of, 381
- House of Lords*, composition of, 15; voting on First-Fruits Bill, 17; difficulties with Supremacy Act, 19; passes the act, 20; voting on Uniformity Act, 29, 30; amends

- Consecrations Act, 132; divided opinion in, 159; resists interference with the Church, 231
- Humphrey*, President of Magdalen, Oxford, his letter to Bullinger, 112; champion of nonconformity, 113; his controversy with the bishops, 115; his complaint of the "Advertisements," 121
- Hutchinson*, in conference with puritans, 262
- Hutton*, Archbishop of York, his fears of recusancy, 318
- Independency*, its commencement, 202; new leaders of, 258; tenets of, 259; its controversy with presbyterianism, 260; conferences about, 261; pamphlets of, 263; its conventicles dispersed, 362; growth of, 384
- Injunctions*, of 1559 Visitation, 35; for cathedrals, 43; on clerical dress, 55
- Inns of Court*, 153, 215
- Interpretations and Further Considerations*, 59
- Ireland*, Papist attempt on, 215; its need of clergy, 296
- James I.*, King of England, his accession, 286; his religious experiences, 287; plots against, 288; his attitude towards recusants, 289; and towards puritans, 291, 306; his favourable impression of puritanism, 293; his action on the Millenary Petition, 295; summons Hampton Court Conference, 296; his share in the Authorised Version, 300; reverses Elizabeth's simoniacal policy, 303; indecision of, 309; opens his first parliament, 310; his dealings with parliamentary puritanism, 312; and with puritan ministers, 316, 317; his instructions to Bancroft, 318; his foreign negotiations, 324; vetoes "Convocation book," 333; his views on prerogative, 334; his "Apology for the Oath," 345; summons Andrewes to his help, 346; projects a college, 349; his dissensions with parliament, 350; arbitrates in the Fuller case, 360; supports the bishops in the Council, 361; but temporises, 362; fresh conflict with parliament, 362; his speech on church affairs, 364; obtains bishops for Scotland, 365; his reasons for choosing Abbot, 366; his anger with Coke, 368; attempts to quiet the lawyers, 369; a champion of orthodoxy, 370; reprieves a heretic, 371; his taste for theology, 372; vacillation with recusants, 373; his breach with parliament, 375; rules without parliament, 376; his foreign policy, 377; his "Book of Sports," 381
- James*, execution of, 267
- Jesuits*, their English mission, 216; their programme, 217; in prison, 269; breach with the Seculars, 271; and the Gunpowder Plot, 328; difficulties with the Oath of Allegiance, 336; troubles of, 339; their dissensions with the Seculars, 375
- Jewel*, Bp. of Salisbury, 342; complains of episcopal influence in the Lords, 15, 20; his report on the Visitation, 42; consecrated, 48; inspires complaint of ornaments, 54; his learning, 71; his early life, 86; his challenge to papists, 87; his correspondence with Cole, 87; replies to Harding, 88; issues his "Apology," 90; his sermons on the papal bull, 151; patron of Hooker, 235; his theology enjoined, 364
- Jewel, Melancthon*, puritan agent in Midlands, 316; suit against the Bp. of Exeter, 317; imprisoned, 318
- Johnson, Francis*, leader of Independents, 266; at Amsterdam, 384
- Johnson, John*, his disclosure of puritan plans, 278
- Johnson, Robert*, troubles of, 172
- Jones*, imprisoned, 313
- Ket, Francis*, burnt for heresy, 370
- King*, Bp. of London, his attitude on the Essex divorce suit, 372
- Kitchin*, Bp. of Llandaff, does not refuse Supremacy Oath, 35; retains his bishopric, 45; summoned to Parkers consecration, 46; not present, 47; unhonourable, 71

- Knewstubs*, at Hampton Court, 296
Knollys, Sir Francis, his favour of puritans, 226; his differences with Whitgift, 231; a typical nonconformist, 276; supports puritan attempts in parliament, 277
- Ladd*, defended by Fuller, 359
Lambeth, consecration of Parker at, 48; trial of nonconformists at, 118
Lancashire League, 141
Lancashire Petition, 317
Latham, execution of, 374
Laud, William, 350; Abbot's dealings with, 366; at Oxford, 371; made bishop, 378; contrasted with Andrewes, 387
Legate, burnt for his opinions, 370
Leicester, Earl of, receives puritan protests, 113; puritan champion, 115; his protection of puritans, 185, 226; animosity to Parker, 188
Lincoln diocese, 315
Line, Mistress, execution of, 269
Litany, The English, used early in Elizabeth's reign, 5; allowed by authority, 10; sung at the opening of parliament, 14; the first of the changes, 32; used in parliament, 32; forbidden in procession, 36; ordered in place of daily mass, 136; ordered in the army, 144
Littleton, execution of, 329
London, proceedings in, 42, 117 120, 123
London diocese, 104, 174, 185, 317
Louvain, first recusant centre abroad, 136, 138; pamphlets from, 209
- Marprelate Tracts*, "The Epistle," 249; "Epitome," 251; further tracts, 253; replies to, 253; authorship of, 254
Marriage, wives of clergy to be approved, 36; wives forbidden to reside in collegiate precincts, 68; proportion of married clergy, 107
Martial, John, his "Treatise of the Cross," 83
Martin, Dr., states canonist view of law, 368
Martinengo, Papal Nuncio, his mission, 74; audience refused to, 75
- Mary*, Queen of England, position at her death, 1; discarded title "Supreme Head," 3; her restoration of church law, 351
Mary of Lorraine, in Scotland, 1
Mary, Queen of Scots, her marriage, 1; her claims to the English Crown, 4; plot in favour of, 93; danger from, 132; her flight to England, 141; plots in the North, 143; removed to Coventry, 145; supported by foreign powers, 158; plots with Norfolk, 177; her claims pressed by Jesuits, 240; further plots in favour of, 241; popular hatred of, 242; Babington's plot, 244; her trial and execution, 245
Mason, Francis, his refutation of Nag's Head Fable, 374
May, Bp. of Carlisle, commissioner for revision of prayer-book, 8; nominated for York, 59; his consecration, 194
Mayflower, The, voyage of, 384
Mayne, Cuthbert, his history, 210; trial, 211; merits of his case, 212; his execution, 213
Mechlin, English nuns at, 215
Melville, Andrew, champion of Scottish Presbyterianism, 365
Mendoza, Spanish ambassador, dismissed, 241
Merbury, Francis, imprisoned, 196
Meyrick, Bp. of Bangor, consecrated, 48
Middelburg, puritans at, 203, 258
Mildmay, Sir Walter, his speech on anti-Jesuit Bill, 218; his differences with Whitgift, 231; his foundation of Emmanuel College, 343
Millenary Petition, 292, 306
Monasteries, effects of their dissolution on benefices, 301
Montagu, Lord, votes against Supremacy Act, 19, 20, 26
Monteagle, Lord, warned of Gunpowder Plot, 326
Morgan, his plots, 244
Morice, his puritan action in parliament, 277; his view of oath *ex officio*, 279; supports Cawdray, 282
Morton, Nicholas, papal envoy, 143, 149

- Morwen, John*, his pamphlet on the St. Paul's fire, 82
- Mullens, Archdeacon*, in conference with Independents, 262
- Mullineux, Sir R.*, 112
- Münster*, Anabaptists at, 261
- Mush*, settles recusant difficulties, 272; resists Blackwell, 273
- Music*, regulations of Royal Visitation concerning, 37; puritan view of, 110
- Nag's Head Fable*, its nature, 47; its vogue, 374
- Napper*, recantation of, 268
- Neile*, Bp. of Lincoln, replies to attacks on clergy, 376
- Nelson, John*, execution of, 213
- Neville, Edmund*, betrays Parry's Plot, 243
- Nicholls John*, recants, 218, 268
- Norfolk*, rising in, 153
- Norfolk, Duke of*, imprisoned, 143; plots with, 153, 158; his adherents in the Lords, 159; release of, 176; his share in Ridolfi's plot, 177; execution of, 177
- Northampton Model, The*, 168
- Northumberland, Earl of*, sides with Mary of Scotland, 141; promises her support, 143; defeat and death, 145
- Norton*, his pamphlets on papal bull, 151; favours compulsory communion, 161; produces Book of Canons, 165
- Norwich diocese*, 62, 69, 186
- Nowell, Alexander*, Dean of St. Paul's, 33; defends Jewel, 89; prolocutor in convocation, 97; his catechism, 97, 167, 298; his influence, 142
- Oath of Allegiance*, imposed, 330; troubles with, 336; demand for modification of, 338; controversy about, 345; forbidden by Pope, 373
- Oath of Supremacy*, its terms, 33; Commission enforces it, 33; refused by the Marian bishops, 34; enforced at royal visitation, 35; generally accepted, 41; administered by the Commission, 45
- Oath ex officio*, its nature, 229; Burghley's objections to, 230; upheld at law, 279; discussed at Hampton Court, 298; pamphlets against, 356; parliament petitions against, 358
- Oglethorp*, Bp. of Carlisle, forbidden to elevate the Host, 9; crowns Elizabeth, 11
- Oldcorne*, arrested, 327; executed, 329
- Ordination*, indiscriminate, 60; required for fellowship, 66; of readers, 108
- Ornaments*, destroyed at Royal Visitation, 42; used in royal chapel, 53; at episcopal consecrations, 53; disputation about, 54; little used, 55; Sandys' gloss on the rubric, 55; neglect of, 68; orders for restoration of, 70; little regarded, 108; before puritan ascendancy, 111; at Oxford, 136; in Lincolnshire, 137; puritan *tu quoque* on neglect of, 229; revival of, 386
- Osorio, Bishop*, his attack on English Church, 81; answers Haddon, 82
- Overall*, professor at Cambridge, 283; his influence, 284; his Catechism, 298; "Convocation Book" of, 333
- Overbury, Sir Thomas*, murder of, 374
- Overton*, Bp. of Lichfield, unpopular, 223
- Owen*, takes Oath of Supremacy, 267
- Owen, N.*, torture and suicide of, 340
- Oxford*, visitation of, 65; fellowship qualification at, 66; conservatism of, 66; vestiarian troubles at, 117; a centre of recusancy, 135, 215; opposes Millenary Petition, 294; conservative tendency of, 343
- Paine, John*, emissary of Douai, 210
- Parker*, Archbishop of Canterbury, early history of, 6; reluctance for high office, 7; character, 7, 8; ecclesiastical commissioner, 44; difficulties of his consecration, 46; elaborate attestation of his consecration, 47; the ceremony, 48; protests against chapel royal ornaments, 53; but changes his opinion, 54; discards episcopal vestments, 56; his large ordinations, 60; his

- visitation of Eton, 65; and Oxford, 66; supports marriage of clergy, 69; a catholic-minded reformer, 71; provides for reservation, 79; approves Jewel's "Apology," 90; his view of reform, 94; opens convocation, 96; his mildness, 102; his blame of Grindal, 110; forwards royal edict on conformity, 114; deserted by Cecil, 115; acts on his own responsibility, 116; his report on the situation, 117; his "Advertisements," 118; his opinion of nonconformists, 119; his determination, 120; his opinion on the vestiarian controversy, 125; his gentleness, 134; his comment on London, 135; his proceedings at Oxford, 136; his dealings with Southworth, 142; his report on Canterbury, 155; his difficulties in reforming scandals, 157; his book of canon law, 165; failing strength of, 171; suspected by Elizabeth, 175; urges proceedings against Mary, 177; unpopularity of, 185; suppresses prophesyings, 186; his negotiations with Parkhurst, 187; his tastes, 188; death of, 188; his character and work, 189; his defence of the commission, 355
- Parkhurst*, Bp. of Norwich, his additions to visitation articles, 62; censured for remissness, 69; a thorough reformer, 71; his favour to puritanism, 110; further censure of, 153; his weakness, 186; his treatment of prophesyings, 186
- Parliament*, *Acts of*, Assurance of the Queen's Power, 100; Church Lands (Alienation), 303; Conventicle Act, 265; Collation of Bishops Act, 21; Ecclesiastical Lands (Exchange), 25; Episcopal Consecration Act, 131; Ecclesiastical Discipline, 100, 162; First Fruits Act, 17; Penal Laws against recusants, 159, 230; Supremacy, 5, 18, 22, 25, 30; Uniformity, 5, 27, 30, 42
- Parpaglia*, *Abbot*, bears papal letter to Elizabeth, 73; recalled, 74; his instructions, 77
- Parry*, *Dr.*, his plot, 243
- Parsons*, *Father*, his character, 216; in London, 217; hunted, 218; his plotting, 239; bad influence of, 270; his dealings with seculars, 271; his "Conference about the Succession," 272, 286; his quarrels with seculars, 272; his devotional book, 285; convocation's reply to, 333; urges condemnation of oath of allegiance, 336; his controversy with Hastings, 345; death of, 375
- Paul IV.*, *Pope*, early relations with Elizabeth, 4; described by Heath, 20; dealings with Marian bishops, 57, 58; friendly to Elizabeth, 73
- Paul V.*, *Pope*, on the succession to the crown, 286; condemns the oath of allegiance, 336; death of, 380
- Paul's Cross Pulpit*, tuned, 3; occupied by Parker, 7; by Christopher, 12; by Grindal, 33; by Pilkington, 82; by Jewel, 87; by Bancroft, 275
- Pedder*, Dean of Worcester, slovenly services of, 95
- Penry*, his "Supplication to Parliament," 253; his controversy with Some, 262; execution of, 265, 269
- Percy*, *Thomas*, in the Gunpowder Plot, 324; killed, 327
- Perkins*, *William*, his "Reformed Catholicke," 343, 345
- Perron*, *Cardinal du*, controversial efforts of, 349
- Peter Martyr*, his advice on clerical dress, 56
- Philip*, King of Spain, Elizabeth's first ally, 3; an uncertain friend, 16; his fear of France, 50; delays papal nuncio, 74; his tortuous diplomacy, 93; his plots against Elizabeth, 241; his Armada, 254
- Pilkington*, Bp. of Durham, returns from exile, 8; commissioner for prayer-book revision, 8; his difficulties with recusants, 67; abusive, 71; his sermon on St. Paul's fire, 82; replies to Morwen, 83; his report on recusancy, 151
- Pius IV.*, *Pope*, sends Elizabeth, 73; presentatives to

- of his action, 76; forbids attendance at English services, 78
- Pius V., Pope*, his election and policy, 140; subsidises northern revolt, 145, 148; excommunicates Elizabeth, 149; his bull *Regnans in excelsis*, 149; disappointed, 176
- Plowden*, 154
- Plumbers' Hall*, 127
- Pluralism*, evils of, 105; in cathedral chapters, 106
- Pole*, Bp. of Peterborough, doubtful as to supremacy oath, 35; deprived, 45; left at liberty, 57; his death, 57
- Pole, Cardinal*, death of, 1
- Pole plot*, 93
- Popham*, limits oath *ex officio*, 358
- Pound, Thomas*, his sufferings, 338; a Jesuit, 339; his death, 340
- Powell, Gabriel*, his "Consideration" of the Lincoln petition, 331
- Præmunire*, threat to Marian bishops, 4; incurred by refusing supremacy oath, 33; by extolling the pope, 100; by hearing mass in Latin, 133; extensions of, 160; dispute about, 361
- Prayer-book*, revision proposed, 5; the revisers, 6, 8; chief task of parliament, 26; Guest argues against first prayer-book, 27; the second book in Act of Uniformity, 28; new book in general use, 33; enforced at royal visitation, 35; use of, at Exeter, 43; divergence from, 44; separate from ordinal, 47; declared "agreeable to Scripture," 60; agitation against, 95; debate on, in convocation, 98; the service under, 111; discarded by puritans, 226; daily services under, 284; discussed at Hampton Court, 296; changes in, 298; further changes proposed, 309
- Preachers*, commend reform, 58; proportion among clergy, 107; licenses recalled, 127; demanded for ordinations, 200
- Presbyterianism*, growth of, 126, 155, 201; organisation of within the Church, 225; the real puritan issue, 275; in Scotland, 287
- Prior, Gerald*, nonconformity of, 381; his Calvinism, 382
- Processions*, abandoned at Corpus Christi, 33; forbidden except at Rogationtide, 36
- Proclamation*, as to worship (1558), 9; authorising communion in both kinds, 22; against iconoclasts, 68, 70; against schismatics, 69; of Lent, 101; of the northern earls, 144; of Sussex in reply, 145; against puritan pamphlets, 185; against independents, 203; of James I. against recusants, 290; on puritan grievances, 314
- Propheysings*, beginnings of, 169; troubles with, 186; Grindal's dealings with, 194; allowed under restrictions, 233
- Psalter, Metrical*, used at funerals, 32; spread of its use, 43; riotous use of at Exeter; allowed by the Commission, 44; differences about, 62; at Oxford, 66; at Cambridge, 115; in the Northampton Model, 168; Whittingham's share in, 173
- Puritanism*, see also Geneva: first years of, 5; its early freedom, 71; dissatisfaction with the Church, 94; agitation against prayer-book, 95; proposals in convocation, 98; dissatisfied with convocation, 110; trial at Lambeth, 118; proceedings against, 122; crimes of, 125; its position in the Church, 126; preacher's licenses recalled, 127; first conventicle, 127; growth of, 155; complaints of the episcopate, 156; and of ecclesiastical discipline, 157; opposed by the Queen, 161; folly of concessions to, 167; better sort of, 168; the Northampton model, 169; fresh grievances of, 174; reckless assertions of, 175; further differences with Elizabeth, 177; access of strength to, 181; dealings with, 184; Leicester's protection of, 185; justification for its complaints, 191; meetings suppressed, 194; development of, 195; measures against, 196; sabbatarian views of, 197; its action in parlia-

- ment, 198; widening breach with the bishops, 199; presbyterian tendencies, 201; the Brownists, 202; organisation of, 225; indefensible conduct of, 226; protest against Whitgift's articles, 227; attempts in parliament, 231; not to be satisfied, 233; generous treatment of, 234; use of the press, 235; last parliamentary efforts, 246; general disobedience of, 247; re-statement of its position, 248; in conflict with independency, 260; attacks on independency, 263; plot against Elizabeth, 263; fresh penal laws against, 265; Bancroft's sermon against, 275; in parliament, 277; cases in civil and ecclesiastical courts, 278; at Cambridge, 283; its hopes of James I., 287; protest against James's proclamation, 290; three views of, 291; the Millenary Petition, 292; memorial of abuses, 293; agitation of, 294; Hampton Court conference with, 296; gains of, 300; its hatred of Whitgift, 305; fresh parliamentary efforts, 308, 311; conference between bishops and Commons, 312; rebellion against the canons, 314; agitation throughout the country, 316, 317; at Cambridge, 318; campaign against, 319; protests of, 320; exaggerated estimates of, 321; change in the spirit of, 322; grievances in parliament, 331; resorts to litigation, 334; attacks on the Commission, 356; Bancroft's success with, 362; grievances in parliament, 363; dislike of Abbot, 367; the party in Northamptonshire, 372; its suspicion of the King, 373; its hold on the Commons, 375, 377; protests against Spanish marriage, 383; the *Mayflower*, 384
- Quadra, Spanish Ambassador*, his support of the papal nuncio, 75; his opinion of Elizabeth's reply, 76; forwards recusant appeal, 78; misunderstands Elizabeth's action, 133; a centre of disaffection, 135
- Raleigh, Sir W.*, imprisoned, 288; his greed, 303
- Rastell, John*, his attack on Jewel, 89
- Ravis, Bp. of London*, his deprivation of puritans, 321
- Readers*, ordained, 108; decline of the order, 167
- Recusants*, first measures against, 5; further measures, 37; imprisoned 57; suspected plots of, 57; growing indignation against, 58; officially so styled, 59; entertained at Hereford, 64; at Oxford, 66; public sympathy for, 67; proceedings against, 70; anxious for papal approval of prayer-book, 77; appeal to the pope, 78; growth of divergence from the Church, 80; pamphlets issued by, 93; stringent measures against, 99; distinctive term for papists, 129; their position, 133; result of their repression, 134; intrigues with Spain, 135; proceedings at Oxford, 136; in exile, 138; dissatisfaction in the north, 139; Pius V.'s support of, 140; the Lancashire league, 141; Southworth and Mullineux, 142; northern revolt, 144; repression of, 146; forced into treason, 150; feeling of, 151; rising in Norfolk, 153; among the lawyers, 153; in Chichester, 154; legislation against, 159; justification of, 191; activity against, 196; fresh troubles with, 206; first-fruits of Douai, 207; the seminaries, 208; literature of, 209; the case of Mayne, 210-213; other victims, 213; returns for fines, 214; treatment of, 215; Jesuit mission, 216; executions of, 220; the better sort of, 239; damage to from political intrigue, 240; lenient treatment of, 241; plots of, 241; fierce feeling against, 244; at the time of the Armada, 254; and subsequently, 255; more penal laws against, 265; increased persecution of, 266; sufferings of seminaries, 267; many recant, 268; many suffer, 269; increasing loyalty of, 270; dissensions among, 271; appeal to Rome, 273; their


- hopes of James I., 287; their position at his accession, 289; repression of, 290; supplication to James, 309; variations in their fortunes, 324; conspiracies of, 326; the Gunpowder Plot, 327; fresh laws against, 329; their appeal to Bancroft, 330; effect of Gunpowder Plot, 335; the oath trouble, 336, 345; farming out of fines, 337; sufferings of, 338; their controversies, 342; subject to the Commission, 357; dealings with, 362; puritan complaints of leniency to, 363; varying fortunes of, 373; internal dissensions, 375; puritan measures against, 380
- Reformatio Legum*, 79, 164, 165
- Reservation for the sick*, 79
- Reynolds*, at Hampton Court, 296
- Rich, Lord*, presents Chope, 334
- Ridley*, his "View of Civil and Ecclesiastical Law," 361
- Ridolfi*, agent of the pope, 158; his plot, 176
- Robinson, James*, at Leyden, 384
- Romanists*, see Recusants.
- Roods*, destruction of, 42; attempted restoration of, 54; royal orders concerning, 69
- Roper, Sir Anthony*, his case, 358
- Saint Paul's cathedral*, stronghold of the Marians, 33; changes ordered by the visitors, 42; disgraceful condition of, 70; fire at, 82
- Salisbury*, Bp.-Suffragan of Thetford, at Parker's consecration, 47
- Sampson*, Dean of Christchurch, champion of nonconformity, 113; his controversy with the bishops, 115; Bullinger's opinion of, 116
- Sanders*, papal commission to, 140; controversy with Dering, 183; attempt on Ireland, 215; death, 216
- Sandys*, Archbp. of York, preaches at Nottingham visitation, 40; consecrated bishop of Worcester, 48; his gloss on the ornaments rubric, 55; his liturgical proposals, 98; translation to London, 171; proposes national council, 185; sanctions scheme for puritan "exercises," 194; agrees to puritan demands, 199; his visitation of Durham, 201; his report on recusancy in York, 214; his dealings with northern puritans, 234
- Saravia, Hadrian*, 386; comes to England, 276; defends episcopacy, 276
- Schifanoja*, 23
- Schools*, treatment of, under Edward VI., 102
- Scory*, Bp. of Hereford, at Parker's consecration, 47; preaches at it, 48; state of his diocese, 63
- Scotland*, ally of France, 50; consecration of bishops for, 364
- Scott*, Bishop of Chester, speaks against Act of Supremacy, 20; against Act of Uniformity, 30
- Sermons*, order to be preserved at, 37; ordered at Winchester, 64; topics for, 65; puritan exaltation of, 111
- Seymour, Lord*, 2
- Shacklock, Richard*, translates Osorio's attack, 82
- Sheldon, Richard*, conforms, 374
- Sherwin, Ralph*, chaplain to bp. Goldwell, 219; execution of, 220
- Sherwood, Thos.*, execution of, 213
- Shrewsbury, Lord*, votes against Act of Supremacy, 19, 20
- Sicklemore*, his equivocations, 328
- Silva, Don Guzman de*, Spanish Ambassador, succeeds Quadra, 135; his intrigues, 135; valuation of papal Bull, 150; his expulsion, 177
- Simony*, under Elizabeth, 303
- Smith, Sir T.*, commissioner for prayer-book revision, 6
- Smith, of St. Nicholas Acon*, deprived, 317
- Snape, Edmund*, before the commission, 278; and Star Chamber, 279
- Some, Dr.*, book against sectaries, 262
- Somerville*, attempt on Elizabeth, 241
- Southwell, Father*, suffers as a Jesuit, 269; his arrival, 279
- Southworth, Sir J.*, 142
- Spain*, hollow alliance with, 50; interest in Bonner, 131; attitude towards England, 176; successes in Netherlands, 206; war with, 244;

- the Armada, 254; waning influence of, 256; fresh efforts of, 266; James's negotiations with, 324
- Spanish Ambassador*. See Feria, Quadra, Aquila, Silva, Mendoza, Gondomar.
- Spark*, at Hampton Court, 296
- Spencer, Sir Richard*, defends church principles in parliament, 332
- Sperin*, conference with, 262
- Spottiswoode*, Abp. of Glasgow, 365
- Stanley*, Bp. of Sodor and Man, doubtful as to Supremacy Oath, 35; retains his bishopric, 45
- Stanley, Sir William*, 270, 272
- Stapleton, John*, 309; writes against Horne, 86; supported from England, 154; at Douai, 207
- Star Chamber, Court of*, puritans prosecuted in, 279; enforces oath *ex officio*, 280; puritan appeal to, 282; anti-puritan decisions in, 320
- Steevens*, his association with Pound, 338, 339
- Stokes, Dr.*, assists Barrow, 261; conforms, 263
- Stone*, discloses puritan plans, 279
- Story, Dr.*, 135, 138
- Strickland*, puritan intolerance of, 160, 161; asks for the Book of Canons, 165
- Stubbs*, his "Gaping Gulph," 197
- Sugar*, execution of, 325
- Sunday*, puritan observance of, 197; sabbatarian proposals for, 381
- Supreme Head*, title evaded, 2, 3, 11, 21; hinders return to Henry's position, 16; insisted on by Commons, 17; left to queen's discretion, 19; denounced by Heath, 20; refused by Elizabeth, 21, 25; changed to Supreme Governor, 26; explanation of royal supremacy, 38; puritan dislike of, 227; effects of reassertion of royal supremacy, 350
- Sussex, Earl of*, president of Council of the North, 144; defeats the northern earls, 145
- Sutcliffe, Mathew*, his controversies, 345, 350
- Tedder*, recantation of, 268
- Thacker*, execution of, 204
- Thirlby, Bp.*, deprived, 35
- Throgmorton*, his plot, 241
- Tithe*, appropriation of, 302
- Tortus*, his "Responsio," 346
- Travers*, his "Book of Discipline," 195; his advocacy of Geneva, 200; is refused Mastership of Temple, 235; his controversy with Hooker, 236
- Treason*, extension of, 159; its wide scope, 212; discussion of, 221
- Tregian, Francis*, associate of Mayne, 210; imprisoned, 210
- Trent, Council of*, Elizabeth expresses interest in, 52; English participation not contemplated, 61; its history, 74; Elizabeth's attitude towards, 75; her reasons, 76; recusant appeal to, 78
- Tresham, F.*, warns Montague of Gunpowder Plot, 326; his death, 327
- Tunstall*, Bp. of Durham, only pre-reformation bishop left, 29; summoned to London, 35; his deprivation and death, 45
- Turberville*, Bp. of Exeter, 1
- Turner*, Dean of Bath and Wells, his violent reform tendencies, 63; argues against conformity, 122
- Turner, Dr.*, puritan action of, in the Commons, 231
- Tyrrell, Anthony*, spy of Walsingham, 254; his recantation, 268
- Udall*, denounced by his parish, 234; pamphlets of, 235, 253; suspected of being Marprelate, 251; in prison, 264
- Usher*, preaches at Westminster, 377
- Vaughan*, Bp. of London, his dealings with puritans, 321
- Vaux, Laurence*, his mission to England, 140; his arrest ordered, 141; effect of his letter, 142; his catechism, 239
- Vestiarian Controversy*, its beginning, 54; the dress ordered, 55; the bishops' compromise, 56; advice of Peter Martyr, 56; concessions to the Genevans, 59; early Elizabethan dress, 111; abandonment of Eucharistic vestments, 112; puritan pro-

- tests against clerical dress, 113; underlying principles of, 114; royal edict about, 114; Parker's action, 116; trouble at Cambridge, 117; the "Advertisements," 118; Lambeth trial, 119; the concessions as to conformity, 121; issue of puritan pamphlets, 122; Zurich advises conformity, 123; more pamphlets, 124; opinion abroad, 125; true nature of, 125; almuce forbidden, 167; the "Admonition," 180; puritan *tu quoque*, 229, 319; canons on dress, 314
- Villiers, George*, Duke of Buckingham, supports Spanish Marriage, 379
- Visitation*, power recovered for Crown by Supremacy Act, 35; Royal Visitation (1559), 35; precedents for, 36; historical justification for, 38; progress of Royal Visitation, 40-44; destruction of ornaments at, 55; Metropolitan Visitation (1560), 59; its progress, 61-67; inquiries at, 200
- Vorstius*, professor at Leyden, 370
- Wafer bread*, ordered, 38; objected to, 95; not always used, 115; enforced by Parker, 116; disturbances about, 120; compromise concerning, at Westminster, 376
- Waldegrave*, his press confiscated, 235; refuses to print more Marprelate pamphlets, 253
- Walpole, Father Henry*, executed, 269
- Walsingham*, Secretary of State, his spy system, 244, 254
- Walwood*, imprisoned, 234
- Wandsworth*, puritan meetings, 179
- Ward, Margaret*, execution of, 255
- Watson*, his Bye Plot, 288
- Watson*, Bp. of Lincoln, 270; sent to the Tower, 25; deprived, 34
- Wentworth, Paul*, puritan action of, in parliament, 198, 376
- Wentworth, Peter*, his puritan action in parliament, 198; sent to the Tower, 246
- Westminster Disputation*, *The*, 23
- Westmoreland, Earl of*, supports Mary Queen of Scots, 143; defeat and flight of, 145
- Weston, Father*, imprisoned, 270; complaints of by the seculars, 271; appoints Garnet "agent," 272
- Whitaker*, professor at Cambridge, 282; his Articles, 283; an unsuitable champion of the Church, 342
- White*, Bp. of Winchester, protests against reform, 12; committed to the Tower, 25; deprived, 34
- Whitehead, David*, returns from exile, 8; Commissioner for prayer-book revision, 8; his sequestration and death, 8
- Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 231, 282, 294; at Cambridge, 156; replies to "Admonition," 181; his answer to puritan Articles, 199; appointed archbishop, 223; his doctrinal sympathies, 224; renews ecclesiastical commission, 227; his difficulties with the Council, 228; his difference with Cecil, 229; his reply, 230; his defence to the Commons, 232; his dealings with puritans, 234; refuses Travers at the Temple, 235; silences Travers, 236; in the Marprelate "Epistle," 250; effect of his firmness, 257; intercedes for Udall, 264; his assertion of episcopacy, 276; his reforming action, 277; his description of puritan methods, 278; releases puritans, 280; leniency of, 282; his dealings with Barrett, 283; his church restorations, 284; his view of puritanism, 291; his zeal for learning, 295; his death and character, 304; his defence of the Commission, 355
- Whittingham, Dean of Durham*, forced to conform, 122; warns Newcastle of Northern Revolt, 144; proceedings against, 173, 201; death of, 201
- Wiburn*, 175
- Wigginton*, unlicensed preacher, 234
- Wightman*, trial and execution, 370
- Wilcox, Thos.*, author of "Admonition," 179; his punishment, 180; popularity of, 182; his disappointment with London ministers, 185; censured by puritans, 225
- William of Orange*, assassinated, 242
- Williams*, Dean of Westminster, his

- | | |
|--|--|
| offer to the Commons, 377 ; made
Bishop, 378
<i>Winchester College</i> , visited, 65
<i>Winchester diocese</i> , 64
<i>Winter</i> , his share in Gunpowder
Plot, 324
<i>Winwood</i> , Speaker, 376
<i>Wotton</i> , his defence of Perkins, 345
<i>Wright</i> , his share in Gunpowder
Plot, 324 | <i>Wright</i> , presbyterian conspirator, 278
<i>York diocese</i> , 151, 214
<i>Zanchius of Heidelberg</i> , his expostula-
tion to Elizabeth, 174
<i>Zurich Divines</i> , appealed to on the
vestiarian question, 123 ; unsatis-
factory to nonconformists, 124 ;
try to arrange a compromise, 125 |
|--|--|

THE END



GUARDIAN.—"If it goes on as it has begun, the new work will be indispensable to all serious students of the history of the English Church."

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

EDITED BY THE LATE

VERY REV. W. R. W. STEPHENS, D.D.

DEAN OF WINCHESTER

AND

THE REV. WILLIAM HUNT, LITT.D.

A Continuous History, based upon a careful Study of Original Authorities,
and of the best Ancient and Modern Writers.

In Eight Volumes, uniform binding, Crown 8vo. With Maps.

Each Volume is sold separately, and has its own Index.

Vol. I. **The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest.** By the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, LITT.D. 7s. 6d.
[Ready.]

Vol. II. **The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I.** By DEAN STEPHENS. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

Vol. III. **The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.** By the Rev. Canon CAPES, late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

Vol. IV. **The English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary.** By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

Vol. V. **The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.** By the Rev. W. H. FRERE. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

Vol. VI. **The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne.** By the Rev. W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

Vol. VII. **The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.** By the Rev. Canon OVERTON, D.D., and the Rev. F. RELTON.
[In preparation.]

Vol. VIII. **The English Church in the Nineteenth Century.** By F. W. CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College.
[In preparation.]

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

MACMILLAN AND CO.'S
NEW THEOLOGICAL WORKS

The Apocalypse of St. John. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. By H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.

Peterborough Sermons. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Durham. Crown 8vo.

History of the English Bible. By the late Bishop WESTCOTT. A New Edition, revised by W. ALDIS WRIGHT, Litt.D. Crown 8vo.

On Holy Scripture and Criticism, being Addresses and Sermons by the Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester. Crown 8vo.

On the Church of England, being Sermons and Addresses by the Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester. Crown 8vo.


The Gospel and Human Life. Sermons by the late Rev. ALFRED AINGER, M.A., D.D., Master of the Temple and Canon Residentiary of Bristol. Edited, with Preface, by Canon BEECHING. Crown 8vo.

Christian Character. Being some Lectures on the Elements of Christian Ethics. By the Rev. J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A., D.D., Author of "Personality: Human and Divine," "Reason and Revelation," etc. 8vo.

Seeking Life, and other Sermons. By the Right Rev. Bishop PHILLIPS BROOKS. Crown 8vo. 6s.

A History of the Christian Church from the Reformation to the Present Time. By S. CHEETHAM, D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Rochester. Crown 8vo.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.



Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 010 184 005

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-1493

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

DOC MAY 03 1995

FEB 27 1995

